

CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 29
(legislative day of March 4), 1940*

DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Hugh Gladney Grant, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Thailand.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Fred D. Wilder, Angels Camp.
Francis P. O'Brien, Belmont.
Purley O. Van Deren, Broderick.
Floyd F. Howard, Courtland.
Valente F. Dolcini, Davis.
Richard J. Homan, Encinitas.
James A. Lee, Glendora.
Lena M. Burris, Meridian.
Elizabeth M. Taylor, Tulalake.
Genevieve A. King, Winton.
Robert H. DeWitt, Jr., Yreka.

GEORGIA

Thomas W. Dalton, Alto.
Joseph D. Long, Bremen.
Charles L. Adair, Comer.
John Marvin Gillespie, Demorest.
Thomas M. Carson, Lavonia.
Clifton O. Lloyd, Lindale.
William A. Pattillo, Macon.
Irene W. Field, Monroe.
Wilbur N. Harwell, Oxford.
Olen N. Merritt, Ringgold.
Etta Sneed Arnall, Senoia.

ILLINOIS

Jacob Feldman, Batavia.
John W. Rettberg, Divernon.
Harold F. Kuettner, Dundee.
Howard J. Hall, Elburn.
Dorothy A. O'Donnell, Grafton.
Walter T. Smith, Havana.
Edwin C. F. Braun, Lebanon.
John W. Norris, Washington.

KENTUCKY

J. Edgar Moore, Berea.
Walter Clayton Thomason, Georgetown.

MARYLAND

Lena S. Townsend, Girdletree.
Katherine G. O'Donnell, Mountain Lake Park.

MONTANA

John A. Manix, Augusta.
Edgar L. Bowers, Culbertson.
Ralph Drew, Somers.

NEW MEXICO

Helen Anna Childers, Jal.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Marion R. Mayfield, Denmark.

TEXAS

Thomas Aaron Downing, Caddo.
Roberta M. Isom, Carrollton.
Edna Martin, Charlotte.
Guy L. Felmy, Dickens.
Harry L. Humble, Groesbeck.
Clyde T. Martin, Hubbard.
Clarence G. White, Natalia.
Joseph Marecek, Rowena.
William Matthew Burnett, San Marcos.
Annie I. Hackney, Sunset Heights.
Emma S. Vick, Valentine.

VIRGINIA

Lewis N. Glover, Berryville.

WYOMING

Franklin P. Nelson, Evanston.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 29, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Son of God, our Saviour and Redeemer, be patient with our deficiencies; woo all unbrotherliness from our hearts and forgive us in the plenitude of Thy love and mercy; lead us to repentance that Thy very word may have breath in human hands and deeds. Hasten the day, dear Lord, when men shall learn that right and not might, that character and not efficiency, that Christ and not Caesar shall rule; and by these both men and nations are to live. O fill us with one pursuit which shall never lose its enchantment; one task that shall always yield new and soul-deep satisfactions; to deal justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with God. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed without amendment to a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution to extend the time for the filing of the report of the Joint Committee on Forestry.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. GIBSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of Executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of the Interior.
4. Department of Justice.
5. Department of Labor.
6. Department of the Navy.
7. Department of the Treasury.
8. Department of War.
9. Post Office Department.
10. Federal Security Agency.
11. Federal Works Agency.
12. Government Printing Office.

"I AM AN AMERICAN"

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking this morning also for my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], and what I shall say also has the approval of the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], and the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and Speaker BANKHEAD. I am speaking in connection with the "I Am an American" citizenship celebration and I want to draw particular attention to a short radio address by Edward Arnold, vice president of the Screen Actors' Guild, over the N. B. C., on the creed, which was written by Benjamin E. Neal.

This creed should guide and inspire the young voters of this country with a real ideal and understanding of Americanism.

The radio address and creed follow:

RADIO ADDRESS BY EDWARD ARNOLD

In this period of American history, I think it is a fine thing that men and women of good will, regardless of social, political, or religious differences, can find and stand on common American ground.

We may differ as to what we consider the best thing for our country but all true Americans agree on certain fundamentals.

To encourage appreciation of the many liberties and the unequalled benefits of American citizenship, is the purpose back of the "I Am an American" citizenship celebration.

In the brief time allotted me, I can do no finer thing than read to you the creed "I Am an American," which climaxes the annual celebration in honor of 21-year-old young Americans. The creed, written by Ben Neal, founder of the movement, expresses a high American ideal—I am an American.

I AM AN AMERICAN
(By Benjamin E. Neal)

I am an American.
The Golden Rule is my rule.
In humility and with gratitude to Almighty God,
I acknowledge my undying debt
To the founding fathers
Who left me a priceless heritage
Which now is my responsibility.
With steadfast loyalty
I will uphold the Constitution
And the Bill of Rights.
I will treasure my birthright
Of American ideals.
I will place moral integrity
Above worldly possessions.
Problems of interest to my country
Shall be of interest to me.
I will count my right of suffrage
To be a sacred trust,
And I will diligently strive
To prove worthy of that trust.
I will give my full support
To upright public servants.
But those with unclean hands,
I will firmly oppose.
Each obligation that comes to me
As a true American,
I will discharge with honor.
My heart is in America
And America is in my heart.
I am an American.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the short radio address referred to and the creed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial appearing in the Bloch newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article which appeared in the National Grange Monthly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

CARL SCHURZ

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, Napoleon Bonaparte taught Europe a lesson in possibility of individual action which has never been forgotten. It was Napoleon who opened the door wide enough to show to the common people of Europe the incandescent rays of the lamp of liberty shining for all humankind. Himself an autocrat, dominated by vaulting ambition, treading like a giant among pygmies, crushing thrones, heaping coals of fire on the ashen breasts of dying despotisms, putting the washerwoman of yesterday at the head of a social regime, making marshals out of peasant soldiers, tossing dynasties into the discard, showing to the astonished world that rulers playing clown under the false colors of a right by divinity were merely plaster casts, this iconoclastic corporal

from Corsica changed the manner of human thought, gave pinions to heretofore suppressed ideas of a government of the people, and liberty of conscience and worship.

Had it not been for Napoleon there might never have been a revolution in Germany in 1848 and 1849, and the United States of America would have been deprived of the enrichment of its literature and politics and its material wealth by those refugees who fled from tyranny and the black threat of the gibbet and prison cell. From the day the Little Corporal went across the seas to St. Helena to the hour of Bismarck and his iron policy, Germany was in a state of flux politically. Its masses had learned that it might have hope of liberty; that there was such a thing as government by the people; and that the term "citizen" meant more than a pawn with which kings might play. It was in this atmosphere within a castle's wall, where his grandfather lived as a retainer of a petty prince, that Carl Schurz, destined to be the greatest American citizen of German birth, was born March 2, 1829.

Carl Schurz came from a background of peasantry; he became a student with talent, he had an ambition to write history—the history of the lowly and abased. In him was something of the spirit which Victor Hugo gives Marius in *Les Misérables*; the spirit that has stirred every patriot heart since the beginning of time into a protest against tyranny. At 19 he was a revolutionist against the hypocrisy, the falsehood, and the ambition of Frederick William IV. It was an evil time. Men were murdered in the streets of Berlin. The civilians unloaded the bodies in the public square and called for the King to look. They made him take off his hat to the citizen assemblage. It was prophetic of what some day would come to the world when dictators would remove the hat to the people and bow in acquiescence to the will which has no master but its own.

But the promises were not kept. The King lied again. He had been forced by that intriguer for absolutism, Metternich, to rescind every act that in any manner gave emphasis to the power of the people and inspiration of hope for a government in which there was a mass voice instead of one. Metternich was unhorsed but Frederick William IV still stalked in panoply among his subjects. Carl Schurz, a student, was one of the orators of the time. At 19 he was able to sway great assemblages and gave promise of the day when with that same voice in a new and adopted country he would fight the battle for human freedom and help write the epilogue to slavery.

But it was to no definite purpose. The revolution failed. In its failure, in the black hour when there was no longer hope, even then, Schurz, the youth, still said:

I tried indeed to lift myself that so great, so just, so sacred a cause as that of German unity and free government could not possibly fail.

Carl Schurz in his zeal did heroic things. Again I turn to *Les Misérables* and the escape of Jean Valjean carrying the wounded Marius on his shoulders through the cloaca of Paris and find something of the same heroic, desperate fatalism in the escape of Carl Schurz from the castle where he was a prisoner, and again when he rescued his teacher and guide from prison.

At 20 Schurz's character was formed. In all this time he had one pattern—that was America, the Republic of the United States. It is not material for this address to tell the story of the years between the escape from Germany and his final determination to reach America, or how at 25 he stepped on the soil of the Nation in which he was so soon to be a great national figure.

He came to Watertown, Wis., among relatives. Naturally, he was interested in politics and policies. His friends and relatives at Watertown were Democrats. It was a common understanding that the Democratic Party was more kind to foreign peoples than the Whigs. There was no Republican Party. But he was an uncompromising abolitionist. To him the idea of a free nation existing with slavery in any part of it was anathema. He was induced to make speeches in Germany. In 1856, when Fremont was the Republican standard bearer, he blazed a path of righteous indignation over slavery

as an institution in a score of speeches in German in the Wisconsin and Minnesota German settlements.

A year later, illy clad, trousers just over his boot tops, sleeves shiny, a picture of poverty as he was, he stood on the afternoon of Thursday, September 3, 1857, before the Republican State convention at Madison the nominee of the Republican Party of Wisconsin for Lieutenant Governor. From the Janesville Daily Gazette of that time I quote a few words of his speech:

"I am of that class of Germans who know that they owe a debt of honor to the old and a debt of gratitude to their new fatherland, and who, having fought in the battles of freedom in the old country, are aware that they stand here on the last bulwark of liberty in the world and are ready to defend it like the bravest of your own."

As Mr. Schurz concluded his eloquent remarks the convention arose as one man and gave three thundering cheers for Carl Schurz.

Thus came Carl Schurz into the arena of American political life. He began in the State of Wisconsin, where he is still honored. In 2 years he was the most asked-for orator of the time. He went down to Quincy, Ill., and heard Abraham Lincoln debate with Stephen A. Douglas. He spoke to great audiences in a half hundred cities. He was no tergiversator and no mincer of words. He had no tricks of story or banter. He was serious and earnest. He had overcome his struggle with the English language, and his first speech in English was *The Irrepressible Conflict*. He was prophetic in his belief that if slavery was not immediately removed as an issue by its own death there would be arbitrament with arms and in blood. The student of history finds here much to interest.

Honors were heaped upon him. He was a member of the Republican National Committee supporting Lincoln. He was a delegate to conventions. He had mastered English so well that he had all the idioms of the language, all the homely phrases of the American, all the accent which might have been excellent in a life long Yankee. He was a living American; why should he not live in its speech? He piled climax upon climax with inexorable logic and in either; his mother tongue was equally facile. He was an idealist. He had the honesty of fidelity, the courage of a righteous passion for truth, and a conviction that justice must eventually prevail.

He went to Spain as Minister; he came back and commanded a brigade under his old '48 compatriot, Franz Sigel. He was at Bull Run and Chancellorsville; he went with Howard to Chattanooga; he marched with Sherman to the sea, and north when Johnson surrendered. He returned to private life and as an editor of the *Westliche Post*, of St. Louis, and so called attention to his qualities that he was elected to the United States Senate.

He was still a revolutionist. He was not a reformer, as we know reformers. But 14 years before we had the corruption of Credit Mobilier and the scandals of the Belknap war administration he had stood before an audience in Albany Hall in Milwaukee and spoken of political corruption as no man ever had before. What he said then may apply today. It is as sound in 1940 as it was in 1858:

And I do not hesitate to prophesy that if the Republican Party should be unfortunate enough to entangle itself in the same network of corruption with which the Democracy is choking itself to death, the people will strike it down with the same crushing verdict under which Hunkerism is sinking now. And in that case, I confess my heart would behold with grief and sorrow its degradation, but it would have no tears for its defeat. * * * It is true we cannot expect every Republican to be a perfect angel. Even when advocating the purest principles, a man will not at once cast off all the frailties of human nature; and so it may happen, and I am sorry to say it has happened, that some Republicans in the discharge of official duties fell victims to severe temptations. But one thing we can do, we must do, and we shall do. We must not hesitate to denounce every member of our own party who prostitutes his trust and power by dishonest and corrupt transactions as a contemptible villain. And not only that, we must consider and denounce and treat him as a traitor to his party. What we can and must do is to make all dishonest and corrupt practices high treason, and to take every such traitor and pitch him overboard; to condemn him to political death without regard to person or station, without the benefit of clergy.

That was Carl Schurz. He was a revolutionist. He did not believe in opportunism. He started out as a sound-money

man and was never led astray by the chimera of a debased currency. The "isms" and political exigencies that by statutory enactment would redeem mankind from whatever condition he found himself had no advocate and no attorney in Carl Schurz. He defied the Republican Party on many of its legislative acts. He was perhaps the original independent. Never in all this time did he labor for his own aggrandizement. He was punished for this by failure of reelection to the Senate. He was the father of the civil service in the National Government. The time had come when every clerkship and every janitor job was not to be given as political requitement.

He went to Europe and visited Bismarck. He was a welcome guest in the land from which, with a price on his head, he had been exiled by choice to America. There must have been a great satisfaction in sitting with the iron Chancellor and discussing Germany, its past, its present, and its future.

Faithful among the faithless, honest among the dishonest, seeking nothing that did not come to him from the incentive of other minds than himself, he returned to hold the portfolio of Secretary of the Interior under President Hayes. It was the last public office for him. He became wholly American; he surrendered completely to his adopted nationality. He died poor. He had no time to enrich himself. America must be thankful for the revolt of 1848. It gave to us a great American, a great people. It gave to Germany a great German. It gave to the world a brilliant example of a statesman.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, I present a privileged report (Rept. 1900), and send it to the Clerk's desk and ask that the Clerk read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities authorized by the House of Representatives by House Resolution 282, Seventy-fifth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 26, Seventy-sixth Congress, and House Resolution 321, Seventy-sixth Congress, caused to be issued a subpoena directing one James H. Dolsen to appear before the said Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities and to produce all records regarding Communist Party and activities; the subpoena being set forth in words and figures as follows:

By authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Sergeant at Arms, or his special messenger: You are hereby commanded to summon James H. Dolsen, 1413 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Special Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable MARTIN DIES, of Texas, is chairman, and produce all records regarding Communist Party and activities in their chamber in the city of Washington, forthwith, then and there to testify touching matter of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee. Herein fail not, and make return of this summons. Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 22d day of March 1940. W. B. Bankhead, Speaker. Attest: South Trimble, Clerk.

Said subpoena was on March 23, 1940, served upon the said James H. Dolsen by Robert B. Barker, an employee of the said Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities and duly authorized to serve the said subpoena. The return of a service by the said Robert B. Barker being endorsed thereon which is set forth in words and figures as follows:

Subpoena for James H. Dolsen (duces tecum) before the Committee on the Un-American Activities, served March 23, 1940, at 1413 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., on James Hulse Dolsen named herein. Robert B. Barker, Kenneth Romney, Sergeant at Arms, House of Representatives.

Said James H. Dolsen, pursuant to said subpoena and in compliance therewith, appeared before the said committee to give such testimony and to produce such records as required under and by virtue of House Resolution 282, Seventy-fifth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 26, Seventy-sixth Congress, and House Resolution 321, Seventy-sixth Congress.

Said James H. Dolsen, after being duly sworn by the chairman, gave testimony before the subcommittee of the said committee on the 25th day of March 1940, concerning certain matters and things, but refused to give testimony and to answer certain questions propounded to him on the following matters and things:

"The CHAIRMAN. The committee is sitting as a subcommittee composed of Mr. DEMPSEY, the chairman, and Mr. THOMAS. Ask your question.

"Mr. BARKER. Mr. Dolsen, do you know Sonia Strauss?"
 "Mr. DOLSEN. I know Sonia Strauss."
 "Mr. BARKER. Is she a Communist?"
 "Mr. DOLSEN. I decline to answer that question."
 "The CHAIRMAN. Ask the next question."
 "Mr. BARKER. Do you know Joseph Chandler?"
 "The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is requiring you to answer these questions."
 "Mr. DOLSEN. I understand."
 "The CHAIRMAN. And you decline to answer them?"
 "Mr. DOLSEN. That is right."
 "The CHAIRMAN. Would you answer this question: Did you ever sit in a Communist meeting with Sonia Strauss?"
 "Mr. DOLSEN. I decline to answer that question."
 "The CHAIRMAN. The Chair requires you to answer the question, and you decline?"
 "Mr. DOLSEN. That is right." (March 25, 1940. Record, p. 33.)
 "Mr. BARKER. Do you know Alec Steinberg?"
 "Mr. DOLSEN. I do."
 "Mr. BARKER. He is chairman of one of the units of the Communist Party in Allegheny County, is he not?"
 "Mr. DOLSEN. Not that I know of."
 "Mr. BARKER. Is he a Communist?"
 "Mr. DOLSEN. I decline to state."
 "Mr. BARKER. You decline to answer?"
 "Mr. DOLSEN. Yes."
 "The CHAIRMAN. The Chair requires you to answer the question, and you decline to answer it?"
 "Mr. DOLSEN. That is right." (March 25, 1940. Record, p. 34.)
 "Mr. BARKER. Do you know who the chairmen are of the various units of the Communist Party in Allegheny County?"
 "Mr. DOLSEN. I know in some individual cases who the chairmen are."
 "Mr. BARKER. Will you state the ones you do know?"
 "Mr. DOLSEN. If the committee please, I decline to answer that kind of a question, on the same basis as I declined the others."
 "The CHAIRMAN. The committee understands that you decline to state who the chairmen are, the ones that you know in the various units of the Communist Party in Allegheny County."
 "Mr. DOLSEN. That is right."
 "The CHAIRMAN. Do you also decline to answer the question as to who the section organizers are?"
 "Mr. DOLSEN. That is right also."
 "The CHAIRMAN. Do you know who they are?"
 "Mr. DOLSEN. In some cases I do."
 "The CHAIRMAN. You decline to give the committee the names of any of them?"
 "Mr. DOLSEN. That is right." (March 25, 1940. Record, p. 42.)
 "The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has considered that very carefully. Here is the case of a member of the Communist Party using the name of the President of the United States, using that name as a party name, apparently with the consent of the Communist Party, or, at least, without any objection, and the Chair thinks that it is material to find out who did that, because, manifestly, if that practice is permitted, it is very much against public interest. The Chair directs you to answer that question as to the name of the person who gave the name Franklin D. Roosevelt for party purposes."
 "Mr. DOLSEN. Well, I will have to state to the committee that, on the previous grounds, I decline to give that information." (March 25, 1940. Record, p. 47.)
 Because of the foregoing, the said subcommittee of the said Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities has been deprived of the testimony of said James H. Dolsen relative to the subject matter which, under House Resolution 282, Seventy-fifth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 26, Seventy-sixth Congress, and House Resolution 321, Seventy-sixth Congress, said subcommittee of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities was instructed to investigate; and the willful and deliberate refusal of the witness to testify further as hereinbefore set forth is a violation of the subpoena under which the witness had previously appeared and testified, and his willful refusal to testify further without having been first excused as a witness deprives the subcommittee of the said Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities of necessary and pertinent testimony and places the said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The report just read is ordered printed. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 446

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the House of Representatives Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities as to the willful and deliberate refusal of James H. Dolsen to testify before a subcommittee of the said Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said James H. Dolsen may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. DUNN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, am I in order in asking permission to say a few words at this time?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dies], chairman of the committee, is in charge of the resolution. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DIES. Yield for what purpose?

Mr. DUNN. I wish to ask a few important questions.

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DUNN. May I ask the gentleman from Texas, is it not a fact that when Mr. Dolsen was interrogated he stated that he refused to answer because the Constitution did not compel him to do so?

Mr. DIES. He gave as one of the grounds of refusal, as I recall, constitutional grounds, but not whether or not it would tend to incriminate him. He refused to say that that was the ground for his refusal.

Mr. DUNN. I understand he did not say that, but is it not a fact he believed that by answering certain questions he would incriminate himself?

Mr. DIES. I specifically asked him if he refused to answer the question for fear that his answer might tend to incriminate him, and he said specifically that that was not the ground of his refusal.

Mr. DUNN. I will admit I was not present during the entire meeting, but when I was there I did not hear him make that statement.

Mr. DIES. I may say to the gentleman that we do not require witnesses to answer questions where they state, and have some justification for their position, that the answers might tend to incriminate them.

Mr. DUNN. One more question: I was there when the man was asked many questions about whether he knew So-and-So to be a Communist, and he said "Yes" or "No." For example, I was brought into the picture.

Mr. DIES. No; I do not believe the gentleman was brought in.

Mr. DUNN. May I say that the investigator asked Mr. Dolsen if he knew Richard A. Lawry, a Burgess of Homestead. The reply was "West Homestead." The question was asked, "Is he a Communist?" and the answer was "No." The question was asked, "Was he ever a Communist?" and he said "No." Because of that statement this man, who has seven children, has lost his job.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman is speaking of Mr. Lawry?

Mr. DUNN. Yes.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman came to the committee and stated that Mr. Lawry was entitled to be heard. We told the gentleman that we would hear him instantly. He is now in Washington, and we are preparing to hear him.

Mr. DUNN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address entitled "Women and Cancer" to be delivered by me this afternoon; also an address by Dr. Parran, the Surgeon General, on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

GUAM

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise at this time to chide any of you because of your vote against the commercial development of Guam this spring, but I do believe I should call attention to the fact that a very able editorial appeared in the Washington Evening Star on the 26th of this month, 3 nights ago. It would do your heart good to see what the Japanese are doing just 150 miles away from Guam, not on an island that they own but on one of the mandated islands given them after the World War just for administration. We refuse to develop something that is a real asset of our own, an island that we really own and to which we have all proprietary rights, yet here Japan, 150 miles away, is developing an island commercially in exactly the same way we asked that our development of Guam take place, by the dredging of the harbor. I really believe that when this question comes up next year most of my colleagues will see fit to vote for it, and I sincerely hope they will. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the editorial to which I have referred is as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 26, 1940]

JAPAN'S LITTLE JOKE

Japan's belated report on her administration of the mandate islands in the Pacific should prove enlightening—and altogether embarrassing—for those in Congress who were responsible for disapproving the Navy's plans for improvement of the harbor at Guam, our small but strategically important insular possession near the mandate groups. It now appears that while the critics of the Guam project have been expressing fears that harbor improvements at the island might offend Japan, the Japanese have been having a secret little joke at our expense. They have been very busy with some extensive harbor improvements of their own right in the vicinity of our island outpost—with utter unconcern as to whether Uncle Sam would like it or not. While anti-American elements in Japan were viewing with what must have been mock alarm our Navy's plans for dredging coral reefs from Guam's waters, "because Guam is less than 1,500 miles from Japan," Japanese engineers, under cover of strictest secrecy, were dredging a harbor and building a pier at Saipan, about 150 miles north of Guam. Other "harbor improvements" are under way or planned, according to Japan's report for 1938 to the League of Nations, a copy of which has just reached the State Department here.

We will have to take Japan's word for it that the improvements are for commercial purposes. No American is permitted to visit any of the more than 600 islands in the mandate groups. Strangers are not wanted there. The report showed that only 12 foreigners visited the islands in 1938 and none was an American. It will be recalled that only last year, when a fishing boat from Saipan was wrecked at Guam, the Japanese refused to permit an American vessel to return the survivors to Saipan. Instead, the American ship was met at sea by a boat from Saipan.

The report was especially significant by reason of an omission. Although the 1937 report stated specifically that no fortifications were being constructed on the islands there was no such assurance in the present statement, although it is contended here that Japan is obliged to refrain from fortifying them. Whether Japan might feel offended or not, she should be required to give this assurance without further delay. Her report is incomplete without it. And until a complete report is filed, Japan is in no position to protest about any open and aboveboard harbor improvements or even fortifications that we should wish to undertake at Guam.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein the editorial to which I referred.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee to Investigate the National Labor Relations Board may have until midnight tomorrow night to file an intermediate report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House during the coming week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, another cigar factory in my district has closed, throwing out of employment 100 employees. For every employee thrown out like this, about five people go on relief, or must find something else to do. I have a letter from an industrial man employing 600 people, who says, "Since I have been in business during 38 years, I have never felt less disposed to push ahead than I do now." This is all because the Labor Committee is on a sit-down strike, and refuses to take action and amend these laws.

The National Labor Relations Board has ordered certain cigar manufacturers in my district to pay back \$33,000 to their employees. Just recently they ordered a cigar manufacturer to pay back \$2,900, and everyone of the employees went back in his office the next day and laid their money down. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—SCOTT AGAINST EATON

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Elections No. 2, I call up House Resolution 427.

The clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 427

Resolved, That Byron N. Scott was not elected a Member from the Eighteenth Congressional District of the State of California to the House of Representatives at the general election held November 8, 1938; and

Resolved, That Thomas M. Eaton was elected a Member from the Eighteenth Congressional District of the State of California to the House of Representatives at the general election held on November 8, 1938.

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9109) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided between the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9109, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, 1941, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to acknowledge my appreciation to the members of the subcommittee who served with me on this bill. They gave unselfishly of their time and attention and in every way cooperated to the end that an act acceptable alike to the District and the Congress might be evolved. There was no suggestion of partisanship nor of serious disagreement in the committee. Although we expedited our work as much as was consistent with conditions, the committee gave very thorough consideration to every phase of the District budget.

SCOPE OF THE BILL

The bill embraces all regular annual appropriations chargeable to revenues of the District of Columbia, including the

permanent Federal contribution, and also appropriations on account of park areas under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the Zoological Park, and for certain work being performed under the supervision of the Corps of Engineers.

APPROPRIATIONS AND ESTIMATES

The Budget estimates for the purposes contained in this bill will be found in detail beginning on page 911 of the 1941 Budget. In addition to these estimates additional supplemental estimates, which were contained in House Document 585 and House Document 668, were also considered by the committee. The original Budget and the supplemental estimates aggregated \$49,609,418. The bill under consideration carries appropriations totaling \$48,291,717, or a reduction, under the Budget estimates, of \$1,317,701. The bill, however, is in excess of the 1940 appropriation by \$222,510.

Summarizing the estimates and appropriations for 1941, classified by sources of revenue, it would be seen that the bill provides:

	Budget estimates, 1941	Amount in bill for 1941	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with Budget estimates
Payable from—			
Gasoline-tax fund.....	\$4,940,150	\$4,918,990	—\$21,160
Water revenues.....	2,542,980	2,244,830	—298,150
General revenues derived from taxes on real estate, tangible property, public utilities, banks, etc.....	36,126,288	35,127,897	—998,391
U. S. Treasury.....	6,000,000	6,000,000	—
Total, regular annual.....	49,609,418	48,291,717	—1,317,701

APPROPRIATIONS AND REVENUES

The total appropriated in this bill by the committee and chargeable to the general fund of the District of Columbia and the Federal contribution is \$41,127,897. In addition there are other charges against the general fund contained in other appropriation bills, including deficiencies, judgments, and so forth, estimated at \$1,310,203, and making a total estimated charge against the general fund for 1941 amounting to \$42,438,100. The total general-fund revenues for the fiscal year 1941 are estimated to be \$42,723,000. This leaves an estimated surplus for the fiscal year 1941 in the general fund of \$284,900. However, it is estimated that there will be a deficit for the fiscal year 1940 amounting to \$1,085,415, which, after deducting the probable surplus for the fiscal year 1941 amounting to \$284,900, will leave a net deficit at the close of the fiscal year 1941 of \$800,515, unless additional revenue is provided.

The total amount approved by the committee payable from the gasoline tax and motor-vehicle fund is \$4,918,990. This fund is available only for use in connection with highway department and related expenditures. The estimated revenue available in the fund for 1941 is \$4,987,388.

The committee has approved a total of \$2,244,830 payable from the water fund of the District. This fund is available only for water department expenditures. The estimated revenue available in this fund for the fiscal year 1941 is \$2,695,410. The committee has recommended in the bill a total of \$2,244,830. If this amount is approved for the fiscal year 1941, there will remain in the fund at the close of that fiscal year the estimated sum of \$450,580.

The estimated expenditures from trust funds, grants, and indefinite appropriations during the fiscal year 1941 amount to \$3,873,021. This sum is \$6,501,870 below the estimated expenditure of \$10,375,691 for the fiscal year 1940. These expenditures are made under permanent law heretofore enacted by Congress and continue as such until modified or discontinued.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROMOTIONS

In accordance with the policy heretofore approved by the committee in its consideration of previous appropriation bills, and set forth in the committee report on the independent

offices appropriation bill (H. Rept. 1515, 76th Cong.), the committee has eliminated all new money submitted in the estimates for within-grade promotions. The total amount eliminated in connection with this bill amounts to \$47,820. The committee has also continued in the bill a provision contained in the current law which limits the administrative promotions which may be made from lapses to a total of \$50,000 during the next fiscal year and provides that the amount which may be expended for reallocations shall not exceed \$35,000.

PUBLIC WELFARE AND HEALTH INSTITUTIONS

The subcommittee made a personal inspection of each of the institutions coming under the jurisdiction of the Board of Public Welfare and also visited the two major hospitals—Gallinger Hospital and the Tuberculosis Sanatoria at Glandale, Md. A survey of several of the institutions which have been under severe criticism within the past few months was also made by a group of responsible citizens of Washington, who were asked to study and report as to the situation at these places. Also, a person experienced and skilled in the matter of social service and welfare conditions in general was asked to come to Washington and make a careful study of the situation. The Board of Public Welfare and the director were heard, and numerous citizens appeared in connection with these institutions. We are of the opinion that conditions should be improved at three of the institutions under the Board of Public Welfare. The recommendations, which will be discussed in more detail later, reflect the composite opinion of the various groups which have cooperated with the committee in its attempt to improve conditions at these institutions.

DEPARTMENT OF INSPECTIONS

In addition to the denial of funds for additional promotions in this office, the committee has disallowed \$1,440 for a clerk in the electrical division. The committee is of the opinion that the existing clerical staff is adequate to take care of the work.

CARE OF DISTRICT BUILDINGS

For the care of buildings under the control and operation of the District the bill provides a total of \$191,210, which is \$56,070 in excess of the 1940 appropriation and \$9,080 less than the Budget estimates. We have made a net reduction of \$10,780 in the item for fuel, light, and power for the District buildings. The reduction of this amount will leave a total of \$90,340 for the next fiscal year, which is \$38,260 in excess of the 1940 appropriation.

BOARD OF TAX APPEALS

In recommending \$14,040 for the Board of Tax Appeals, which is the amount of the current appropriation, I wish to call attention to the fact that this Board is composed of a single member without any considerable training and experience in matters of property valuation, who is called upon to review and adjust assessments fixed by the Board of Assessors, which has the experience, background, and information to do a better job than anyone else.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

There is recommended for this Commission an appropriation of \$69,920, which is \$500 less than the current appropriation and \$4,280 below the Budget estimates.

CONTINGENT AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

For contingent and miscellaneous expenses for the District, such as printing and binding, postage, advertising, and so forth, the bill allows a total of \$281,360, which is \$34,779 below the 1940 appropriation and \$4,949 under the Budget estimates.

PUBLIC LIBRARY

For the operation and maintenance of the Free Public Library the committee considered estimates totaling \$792,670 and allowed appropriations amounting to \$778,540, which is \$230,950 more than the 1940 appropriation and \$14,130 less than the Budget estimates. The substantial increase over the current appropriation is due almost entirely to the allowance of \$200,000 for continuing construction of the new main library

building, for which an unexpended balance of \$350,000 was made available in the current act. This second appropriation, which is recommended in the bill, will carry forward the project, to be constructed over a 3-year period, leaving a total of \$568,000 unappropriated for completion of the project.

SEWERS

For the continuation of this work we recommend a total of \$1,198,560, which is an increase of \$65,760 over the 1940 appropriation and \$55,350 below the Budget estimates. This reduction in the estimate is applied primarily to funds for the construction of sewers, including assessment and permit work in connection with such construction, the committee having recommended a cut of \$25,000 in each item.

COLLECTION AND DISPOSAL OF REFUSE

A total of \$1,502,180 is contained in the bill for the collection and disposal of refuse, which is \$35,230 in excess of the current appropriation and \$76,020 below the Budget estimates. We allowed increases in the estimates of \$12,030 for street cleaning and snow removal and an increase of \$24,000 over the current appropriation of \$896,000 for the disposal of refuse, which includes the operation of two incinerators. These increases are provided to take care of the normal expansion of work due to the growth of the city.

We eliminated from the bill an estimate of \$75,000 for the purchase of a site for a new high-temperature incinerator to be located somewhere in the northeast section of the city.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

In the consideration of funds to be provided for the public schools the committee had before it estimates totaling \$13,275,312. We recommend a total of \$12,778,773, which represents a decrease of \$590,385 under the 1940 appropriation and is \$496,539 less than the Budget estimates.

For the salaries of administrative and supervisory officers the committee allowed \$706,950, which is \$17,147 in excess of the current appropriation and \$800 less than the estimates. We denied \$6,400 for the employment of two heads of vocational guidance, at \$3,200 each, and transferred to this fund \$5,600, the salary of one first assistant superintendent of community center and recreation activities.

We made a reduction of \$8,800 in the estimate of \$7,338,994 for teachers and librarians, the reduction being due to the allowance of additional funds under the industrial home school for the carrying out of an educational program under the direction of the head of that institution.

Under care of buildings and grounds additional funds have been requested in the estimates for personnel for the operation and maintenance of the Calvin Coolidge Senior High School and the Thomas Jefferson Senior High School, and the committee has recommended personnel which it considers sufficient to operate these two schools.

For the current year an appropriation of \$312,500 was provided for fuel, light, and power, and at that time responsible officials urged that a total of \$325,000 would be required. It is now estimated that during the current fiscal year a total of only \$293,741 will be expended. In view of this fact we have allowed \$300,000.

For contingent expenses there is allowed \$155,000, which is \$18,905 less than the Budget estimate and \$5,000 in excess of the current appropriation.

The committee considered estimates totaling \$313,843 for furniture and equipment, \$4,800 being contained in House Document 668, which proposed that sum as an additional amount for completing the furnishing of the Banneker Junior High School. The committee has allowed \$4,500 for this latter purpose and recommends a reduction of \$19,043 in the original Budget estimate of \$309,043.

A total of \$476,585 was considered by the committee for repairs and improvements, including an estimate of \$11,100 for repairs and improvements, and equipment for the health school on Thirteenth near Allison Street. For this latter purpose the committee has allowed \$9,000.

During hearings on the bill the committee was advised that at the present time there are enrolled in the public schools of the District between 2,700 and 2,800 students who reside in

nearby Maryland and Virginia, and that last year it cost about \$265,000, computed on the basis of per pupil costs, to educate these children. This burden should not be borne by the taxpayers of the District, and we have inserted in the bill a corrective provision requiring the payment of tuition for such children. It should be pointed out, however, that this provision will not affect pupils now enrolled, but will prohibit future enrollment of children for free instruction and will gradually correct the situation over a period of years.

The building projects included in the bill, together with the limit of cost in each instance where such authorization is recommended, are as follows:

Building	Appropriation in the bill	Limit of cost
Syphax School	\$95,000	\$190,000
Junior high school in vicinity of 17th and Q Sts. SE.	445,000	881,850
Vocational school to replace Abbott Vocational School	250,000	500,000
Preparation of plans and specifications for senior high school at 24th St. and Benning Rd. NE.	20,000	900,000

In connection with the provision for the purchase of two building sites, the committee has recommended \$40,000 instead of \$47,000 as contained in the Budget. It is believed that the former sum will be adequate to acquire the land necessary for these purposes.

METROPOLITAN POLICE

A total of \$3,306,480 was considered in the Budget estimates for the salaries and expenses of the Metropolitan Police force for the fiscal year 1941. The bill carries \$3,301,785, which is \$85,850 less than the current appropriation and \$4,695 below the estimates.

We deducted \$2,000 from the estimate of \$18,000 for repairs and improvements to police stations, \$1,000 from the estimate of \$77,150 for contingent expenses, and \$1,700 from the estimate of \$66,700 for the purchase of motor vehicles.

FIRE DEPARTMENT

In recommending a total appropriation of \$2,353,095 for this activity the committee has provided funds which are \$29,895 less than the 1940 appropriation and \$11,910 less than the Budget estimates, such reductions being made in operation and maintenance items, and due primarily to the consolidation of stations made pursuant to the provisions of the 1940 District of Columbia Appropriation Act.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

For the Health Department including the Tuberculosis Sanatoria and the Gallinger Hospital, there is allowed a total of \$2,540,600, which is \$31,740 more than the 1940 appropriation and \$33,600 less than the Budget estimates.

For medical services there is allowed \$399,870, which is \$2,990 less than the Budget estimates and a like amount under the 1940 appropriation. Denial of funds for step-ups, the disallowance of one nurse at \$1,800 per annum, and \$250 for medical supplies for the new southwest health center account for the reductions in this item.

We recommend \$20,000 for furnishing and equipping the new southwest health center instead of \$21,000, as proposed by the Budget, and have eliminated the Budget proposal for \$13,000 to be used to purchase a site for a health center in southwest Washington. The committee is of the opinion that this proposal should be deferred until the school-replacement program is undertaken, at which time one or more sites ideally located for this purpose will be available without additional cost to the District.

The committee recommend an appropriation of \$638,960 for the operation and maintenance of Tuberculosis Sanatoria, which is \$11,592 in excess of the 1940 appropriation and \$3,920 less than the Budget estimates. An increase of \$37,592 over the current appropriation is allowed for personal services in order to place employees in the nursing and dietetic departments on a 44-hour week. Such employees are at present on an average of 49½ or 50 to 50 or 56 hour week.

For personal services at Gallinger Hospital there is allowed \$675,000, which is \$75,660 in excess of the 1940 appropriation and \$12,840 less than the Budget estimates. Increases allowed by the committee will provide necessary personnel for two new buildings and will also be applied to the program of reducing the working hours of hospital personnel.

During hearings on the bill the committee inquired into the number and amount of fees charged patients in the two local District-operated hospitals and gave particular attention to the tuberculosis hospital at Glenn Dale, Md. The committee was informed that at this institution an average of about 25 patients are paying for hospitalization at the rate of from \$1 to \$2 per day. The impression was obtained by the committee during this discussion that too little attention is given to this question and that more careful investigation and regulation would produce greater revenue to the District.

The committee has restored an item providing \$5,000 for general repairs and improvements to Columbia Hospital which was eliminated by the Budget from the 1941 estimates. The District has for years been making a contribution toward the maintenance of this institution but we feel that inasmuch as the land is owned by the United States Government and the buildings were constructed by the Federal Government and the District of Columbia that consideration should be given to the advisability of turning the property over to the District to be operated as a municipal institution or for such other purposes as may be found desirable. The property seems to be valued at around a half million dollars and I can see no reason why the Government should subsidize a privately operated hospital in any such manner.

COURTS

Practically no changes in the appropriations made for the juvenile court, police court, and the municipal court have been made. The aggregate appropriation is \$3,118 less than the 1940 item and \$928 less than the Budget estimates.

PUBLIC WELFARE

Turning now to the Department of Public Welfare, I want to reiterate what has been said about the personal inspection made of every one of the institutions by the members of the subcommittee. While conditions were found to be far from desirable, it must here be said that they were not nearly so bad as has been painted. The chief difficulty has not been lack of funds but the failure to use available moneys in the wisest and most beneficial way. Or, to put it another way, the trouble has been directional and not monetary.

A total of \$7,473,925 is allowed for the several activities and agencies comprising the public-welfare service. This sum is \$123,100 more than the 1940 appropriation and \$20,630 less than the Budget estimates.

For personal services we recommend \$149,900, an increase of \$5,370 in the current appropriation and \$7,160 in excess of the Budget figure. Aside from the deduction of \$1,440 for administrative promotions, we have increased the estimate by \$6,500 to provide for a principal Assistant Director of Public Welfare and a stenographer at \$1,440 per annum. This principal assistant director is to be a capable officer who will devote his entire time to the inspection and administration of the public-welfare institutions of the District, which will be under his immediate supervision and for which he will be responsible. It is the recommendation of the committee that this officer keep in constant touch with conditions at the institutions and visit them at frequent intervals. The committee feels that the fixing of responsibility on one qualified official who will devote his entire time to this duty will do much toward eliminating the unsatisfactory conditions which have existed in several of the institutions.

The receiving home was visited by the members of the committee. The quarters in which this institution is housed are unsuited for the purpose both as to size and arrangement, and it is recommended that the Commissioners give consideration to the location of a new home as soon as the financial condition of the District will permit. The committee believes that immediate steps should be taken to separate delinquent from nondelinquent children who are now

housed together in the present home, and to that end we have allowed funds and inserted a proviso to the appropriation for board and care of children, which will permit the continuous operation and maintenance of two foster homes for the temporary board and care of nondelinquent children. This provision will take care of all children of the nondelinquent class and will correct one of the outstanding causes of complaint against the institution.

For personal services at the jail the committee has allowed \$101,580, which is \$8,280 less than the estimates and \$3,360 more than the 1940 appropriation.

The committee considered a supplemental estimate in the sum of \$64,000 for the completion of an addition to the jail, for which \$250,000 has been provided heretofore. The estimate also proposed an increase in the limit of cost of this building from \$250,000 to \$314,000. In allowing \$44,000 for completion of the building the committee has disapproved an expenditure of the remaining \$20,000 in the estimate intended for use in providing a walled enclosure for the jail yard as not justifying the expenditure involved. In line with the reduction in the estimate the committee has recommended a cut in the proposed limit of cost to \$294,000.

Members of the committee who visited the workhouse and reformatory were favorably impressed with the efficient administration of the affairs of these institutions. The so-called prison industries are well planned and organized and are being carried on under intelligent direction. Discipline among the prisoners is good and the physical condition of the plant is excellent.

We found that the institutions at Lorton are now purchasing their power from local utilities at what we consider an exorbitant price and asked the superintendent to submit a preliminary survey as to the economies which could be effected by the installation of a Diesel or a steam power plant. The preliminary report is shown in the printed hearings. It is suggested that the District Commissioners direct the appropriate authorities to make a careful and detailed study of this question for the purpose of determining whether a plant should be erected. On the basis of a casual study it appears that from one-third to one-half the annual power bill may be saved and the cost of the new installation amortized over a period of 20 years or less.

With the exception of a reduction of \$2,350 in the estimate of \$481,350 for maintenance and supplies for the institution and an item of \$25,000 for a new bakery building, the committee has allowed other estimates as submitted.

Members of the committee who visited the National Training School for Girls were of the opinion that conditions were not satisfactory at the institution and that definite improvements could be made from the standpoint of sanitation and educational opportunities. It is believed this situation could be corrected by additional supervision and with a small additional expenditure for repairs and improvements. To carry into effect these recommendations the committee has provided for a superintendent at \$3,800 per annum to be appointed by the Board of Public Welfare with the approval of the Commissioners, \$1,620 is allowed for an employee to serve as instructor of vocational education, and \$1,800 additional is provided for medical supplies, farm supplies, repairs, and temporary labor. Other increases, including one parole officer and one watchman, are allowed by the committee as provided in the estimates.

The committee at the District Training School found general conditions were fairly good. Some improvements as to segregation of inmates by classes and ages can undoubtedly be effected, and better care of the ground surrounding the building would greatly enhance the appearance of the institution. With the exception of a reduction of \$5,000 in the estimate of \$110,000 for maintenance of the institution, the committee has allowed funds for this school as submitted in the Budget estimates.

The committee members who visited the Industrial Home School were of the opinion that general supervision and administration was satisfactory but that improvements could be effected insofar as the educational program was concerned

and that a small additional sum for repairs and improvements was urgently needed. Teachers from the public schools are at present detailed to this institution for the purpose of instructing inmates. The committee believes that the educational program should be carried on by resident teachers directly under the supervision and control of the superintendent and that vocational training should be emphasized. To accomplish this purpose the committee has provided \$7,570 for four teachers, including one part-time instructor in vocational education who will be appointed by the Board of Public Welfare. An increase of \$1,600 in the estimate of \$23,500 for maintenance is allowed for the purchase of equipment to put the vocational program into effect. An increase of \$1,500 in the estimate of \$5,000 for repairs and improvements will permit the correction of faulty plumbing, improve sanitary conditions, and provide for painting and repair to roofs.

In view of the publicity which has been given conditions at the home for aged and infirm, the committee has paid especial attention to the problem, and members of the committee have made visits to it on different occasions. The committee is of the opinion that most of the criticism leveled against the institution can be corrected by improvement in the supervision and direction of affairs at the home and by a modest increase in personnel to meet existing deficiencies. While the present superintendent of the home has rendered excellent service over a long period of years, the burdens of the work have increased to a point where it is imperative that additional supervisory personnel be provided. To meet this condition the committee has made provision in the bill for a superintendent at \$4,600 per annum. The total new personnel allowed by the committee, including three new employees contained in the Budget estimates, is as follows:

	Increases
Superintendent	\$4,600
2 nurses	3,260
Resident physician	3,800
Stenographer	1,440
7 hospital attendants	8,820
3 attendants	3,760
Total	25,700

To provide needed repairs to existing structures, the committee has added \$7,350 to the estimate of \$5,000 submitted in the Budget. Appropriations for public assistance, which include general relief, home care for dependent children, assistance against old-age want, and pensions for needy blind persons, totaling \$1,678,000, are approved as provided in the estimates. The committee has also approved the proposal of the Budget earmarking \$49,960 of funds for public assistance for use in certifying persons eligible for work relief and surplus commodities.

The committee has inserted in the bill the sum of \$15,000 to provide for the education of handicapped or shut-in children. For the past 2 years this work has been carried on by the Work Projects Administration, which has announced that this work cannot be continued after July 1 next. While the sum provided in the bill is somewhat less than the amount provided from emergency funds, the committee feels that it is the maximum which can be allowed for this purpose and that it is sufficient to do a reasonably good job, especially if attention is given to assembling some of the less handicapped children into small groups at regular intervals. This program should be carried on with the cooperation of the public-school authorities.

MILITIA

Aside from the disallowance of \$120 for administrative promotions, the sum provided for general expenses in connection with the local militia is the same as provided in the estimates and the current law—\$48,880. The committee recommends a reduction of \$200,000 in the estimate of \$1,300,000 for continuation of construction of the new armory building. This reduction will have no effect on the date of completion of the building, which is being constructed under a 3-year program. During the fiscal year 1942 the sum of \$1,150,000 will be required to complete construction of the project.

PUBLIC PARKS

For the several activities making up this appropriation there is recommended \$919,842, which is \$27,951 less than the 1940 appropriation and \$7,280 less than the estimates. With the exception of the disallowance of \$1,680 for administrative promotions and the deduction of the salary of the recreation coordinator—\$5,600—who has been transferred to the public-school pay roll, the funds recommended for this work are the same as proposed in the estimates.

NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

Other than the elimination of funds for promotions, the committee has approved the Budget estimate for this activity. The committee wishes to call attention to the amount set up against this appropriation for telephone charges, which it regards as entirely too large, and recommends that the matter be given study with a view to bringing it in line with essential requirements.

HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

For the several activities provided for under this fund there is recommended \$4,918,990, which is \$241,765 less than the 1940 appropriation and \$21,160 less than the Budget estimates. The committee has provided an additional electrician at \$1,800 per annum to assist in the repair of traffic lights.

In connection with the estimate of \$943,000 for repairs to streets, snow removal, and so forth, the committee has allowed \$922,500 in recommending a reduction of \$20,500 in the item. The increase of \$72,500 over the current appropriation, which is approved by the committee will provide additional funds for snow removal and snow-removal equipment. In this connection, \$25,000 is provided for the purchase of snow plows, and \$12,500 is for the purchase of small tractors especially equipped for snow-removal purposes. Eighteen thousand dollars is provided to reimburse funds used to meet emergency snow-removal expenditures during the current year, leaving \$42,000 in the fund for labor in connection with snow removal during the next fiscal year.

With the approval of the Commissioners the committee has also inserted in the bill a provision making the sum of \$15,000 available from the street-repair fund for the preparation of plans and specifications for an underpass in line of Sixteenth Street NW., at Scott Circle. This project is shown as being especially urgent owing to the congestion of traffic at this point since the opening of the new underpass at Fourteenth Street and Thomas Circle. It is estimated the project will cost nearly \$400,000.

WATER SERVICE

For the general services operating under the Water Department and payable from water-fund revenues, including the laying of water mains, the installation of meters, and so forth, there is recommended \$2,244,830, which is \$194,570 less than the 1940 appropriation and \$298,150 less than the Budget estimates.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. I would just like to make the statement that when the consideration of this bill was first mentioned there was some reluctance on the part of some Members to serve on the committee because of its controversial nature and because of the existence of many other duties which they felt were more of an obligation. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. TAYLOR, selected the gentleman from Florida and asked him to serve as the chairman of the committee, and through a fine spirit of service, almost of self-sacrifice, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CALDWELL], accepted the chairmanship of the committee. Those of us who served with him were very much gratified by the way he handled the work, by his intelligence and conscientious approach to the job, and we feel that the Congress and the District of Columbia have been highly favored in having the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CALDWELL] as chairman of the District of Columbia Subcommittee. [Applause.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the kind words of the gentleman from Kentucky, but I must say that the work which has been done on this bill has been done

by the committee, by the members who voluntarily offered their services and who have done a good job. They have worked hard, rapidly, and faithfully. [Applause.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as ranking member of the minority subcommittee making appropriations for the District of Columbia, I wish to take this opportunity of telling you of my appreciation for the courtesy extended to me by our chairman, the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable MILLARD F. CALDWELL, and other members on this committee who include the gentleman from Texas, Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON; the gentleman from Kentucky, Hon. EMMET O'NEAL; the gentleman from Michigan, Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT; the gentleman from Kansas, Hon. JOHN M. HOUTSON; the gentleman from South Dakota, Hon. FRANCIS H. CASE; and the gentleman from Kansas, Hon. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON. I wish also to add a word of appreciation for the valuable assistance given to us by Mr. William Duval, our committee clerk.

This is the second time I have had the privilege of working on appropriations for the District, and, while it contains very little interest so far as the people of my own congressional district are concerned, I feel that it is an honor to serve on a committee which has to do with the appropriating of funds to carry on the functions of the government of our Nation's Capital. This bill takes in all the regular annual appropriations charged to the revenue of the District, including the permanent Federal contribution of the \$6,000,000, over which there has been so much controversy in the past. This amount has ranged from five millions up to nine millions of dollars, and in spite of many surveys no one has yet informed Congress just what the proper amount should be, in my opinion. Anyway, members of the committee should know that this bill carried over \$48,000,000, in which their own taxpayers have an interest in the Federal contribution of \$6,000,000, plus other Federal benefits which are not reflected in this bill. Compared with the Budget estimate, the bill shows a decrease of \$1,317,701.

In my opinion, there is no other appropriation bill which comes before this House each year which attracts more attention of the people in the District of Columbia than does the bill which we bring before you at this time. It comes to you in finished form after a most careful study and consideration by every member of this committee. It comes to you after a diligent study of each item and after a personal survey of many of the institutions which are located here. The committee brings this bill to you after holding intensive hearings and making it possible for everyone interested in the city to appear before the committee and state their views on various matters.

As is the case in other appropriation bills, your committee members are forced necessarily to depend upon the information and justifications brought to them by the various officers in charge of the various departments of the city government. In this work we were greatly aided by Maj. Dan Donovan, the District auditor, who, I believe, knows more about the District financial problems than any other individual in the city. The committee has gone further this year by making personal investigations and securing information direct from many citizens directly interested and directly affected by taxation. Until the taxpayers and citizens of this city secure a more direct benefit toward securing the privilege of saying how their tax money shall be expended, I feel that this committee has gone the limit in taking the feelings of the local public opinion and of the citizens into consideration before reaching its conclusions.

So far as I know, there is very little controversy in this bill, and it comes to you with the unanimous report of the committee. The hearings contain 559 pages of valuable information, which will indicate to you the length to which the committee went in securing information in order to be fair regarding the wishes of the citizens. The report will give to you explanations on some of the items which will show some changes compared with the items contained in the bill a year ago. I specifically call your attention to the items

regarding education, public health, and public assistance, and the construction items. A close study of the hearings will indicate to you why the newspapers recently have stated that Washington is the third city in the United States in the point of new construction.

Evidence brought before us will indicate that this city and greater Washington is continuing to experience a boom and that thousands of people from all parts of the country are being attracted here because of the gigantic pay roll. As a result of this gigantic growth of the city, taxpayers find that quite a bit of their money goes toward benefits for individuals, which should be borne by taxpayers of other States, largely by the States bordering the District of Columbia. This is brought out by the fact that a year ago 2,400 pupils came to Washington from Maryland and Virginia and secured free tuition. Today that number has jumped to around 2,800, and in reply to a question, the Superintendent of Schools told the committee that the taxpayers of the District of Columbia are forced to pay \$265,000 for tuition for children that should be the responsibility of nearby States. Free medical attention, free hospitalization, and other benefits here are also going to many of the people who should be the responsibility of neighboring States, and just how much of the Federal contribution goes toward these expenditures has not been determined. Yet it is safe to say that the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia government in which money paid by taxpayers in Nebraska and other States in the Union is represented, does find its way into these various expenditures.

Until some other means of appropriating funds for the District is found and until the people in the city who actually pay the bill are given more freedom and more responsibility and right to determine how their money should be spent, this Congress must act as a sort of a city council for the Nation's Capital, and your Subcommittee on Appropriations must do the best it knows how in giving fair treatment to the citizens here. Mr. Chairman, I am proud of my Nation's Capital, and like other Members and other citizens of this Nation, I am very happy to know that every effort is being made on the part of the various agencies in charge to make it the most beautiful capital city in the world. I feel every member of the committee feels the same way about it, but I know they also feel that eventually the citizens here—the taxpayers—will bring about some change in order that they will carry on their responsibility so far as the expenditure of their own money is concerned, and that something will develop in the near future whereby the taxpayers of the other States of the Union will not feel that they are in any way unjustly being taxed for the many benefits derived by the people here.

People in the various States in the Union may not realize that the city of Washington is now probably the fastest growing city in the United States. The fact that the Nation's Capital is located here is the only reason. I make this statement on the basis of facts printed in a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star, which is admitted by every newspaperman here to be the best newspaper published in Washington, and, in fact, one of the best newspapers in the United States. I feel sure that most of the people in the United States would now be happy to have the Capitol of our country located in their city. I know we people in Nebraska would like to have the Capitol in our State. We who have suffered droughts, insect plagues, and so on, would be glad to have some of the benefits which pour into this city as the result of the Capital being located here. So far as I am concerned, I feel that Washington has never felt a depression such as we have been feeling in the State of Nebraska. Let me tell you some of the benefits Washington is receiving as they are shown by the Washington Star:

Washington leads the Nation in concentration of buying power, with private and Government pay rolls ranging between \$43,000,000 and \$50,000,000 a month. The magazine Sales Management estimates annual income in the District of Columbia at \$3,867 per family, higher than for any other area.

Population of the Washington metropolitan area has increased to approximately 950,000, compared with only 621,059 in the 1930 Federal census. Utility connections indicate a gain of 150,000 persons in the last 4 years.

Washington retail trade volume exceeded \$400,000,000 for the first time in history during 1939. Department-store sales swept 3.5 percent ahead of their previous all-time high peak set in 1937 and were 18.2 percent ahead of the 1929 levels.

The rapid building pace necessary to meet greatly expanded needs for housing has attracted Nation-wide attention. More than 13,000 families were provided for in the last year in the metropolitan area. Since the beginning of 1935 more than 50,500 families have been provided for within the same boundaries.

Washington has more telephones in ratio to its population than any other city in the world. At the end of 1939 there were 254,042 connections in the District of Columbia itself. There were 311,027 connections in the metropolitan area.

With approximately 263,000 automobiles in the metropolitan area, Washington is an outstanding market for automotive products. Gasoline consumption in the District of Columbia alone jumped during 1939 to another new record of 143,000,000 gallons.

Millions of people from all over the Nation visit their National Capital every year. Visitors at Smithsonian Institution, mecca of tourists, totaled 2,542,268 during 1939, another new record.

Consumption of electric power and gas forged into new high ground during the year. The home-appliance industry rates Washington one of its most highly developed markets.

[Applause.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. In view of the fact that this measure has to do with the finances of the District of Columbia, is the committee influenced to any great extent by the press references that are made to various items that come up in this bill?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for asking that question, because I know that every Member in the House, when he picks up a local newspaper about a month before the appropriation bill is made up for the District of Columbia, finds a mass of news stories, with great headlines, calling our attention to the various ills of the District of Columbia, but let me tell the gentleman something else. I welcome the information in the press, because I believe that is the only means that the people in the District of Columbia have to express their wishes. They have no other way of expressing their wishes in the District of Columbia, and the molding of opinion here is largely done through the newspapers which perform a great service to the taxpayers in the District who cannot become vocal in any other way.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have listened with interest to the colloquy between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] upon the subject of certain newspaper articles which might be brought to bear and exert an influence on appropriation bills for the District of Columbia. I think perhaps the gentleman will agree with me also that the District of Columbia Committee, charged with legislation for this jurisdiction, at times is criticized because we appoint subcommittees to make inquiry and survey certain ills or bad conditions that are brought to us for our consideration. The most recent investigation along this line is one in which, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESSANDRO], looked into the welfare and hospital situation of the city. The gentleman from Nebraska realizes, I feel sure, that we do well to investigate outstanding complaints which are brought to our attention.

Mr. STEFAN. Oh, the gentleman is absolutely right. His committee performs a valuable work, but I wish to make the record plain that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] was not criticizing. He was seeking information as to how these matters are brought to the attention of the Congress, and had it not been for information brought to us in various newspaper articles, I am sure very little attention would be given to some particular things that Congress would not have the time to investigate. I know that the legislative committee has done wonderful work.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. I rise to say a word in comment of the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska and his devotion to this city. A moment ago he was paying favorable comment to members of the committee. The gentleman from Nebraska has been with the committee for some time, and his knowledge of District affairs is indeed great. I am wondering at this time if it would not be very appropriate for the Committee to have as a matter of record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the appreciation of the committee of Major Donovan.

Mr. STEFAN. Interrupting the gentleman, I am in accord with him and in fact in the extension of my remarks the gentleman will find a commendation of Major Donovan who, I believe, knows more about the District's financial affairs than any other man in Washington.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan who has worked so hard on these bills and I thank him for the help he has given us; but going further into the matter of these newspaper articles, I answer the gentleman from Massachusetts and say yes, they do reflect not only in legislation, but in the appropriation bill, and the bill we have before us carries a considerable reflection of some of the things brought to the attention of Congress and the public in general by the newspapers of Washington.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

THE TREADWAY RESOLUTION FOR THE CREATION OF A FEDERAL TAX COMMISSION

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, my remarks today are addressed to a joint resolution which I have had pending for some time which proposes the creation of a nonpartisan Federal Tax Commission, representing both the Congress and the general public, to make a thorough study of the Federal tax structure and recommend much-needed reforms.

The President of the United States is authority for the statement that taxes in this country "have grown up like Topsy." That is one of the principal faults of our present tax structure. Our tax laws are a veritable hodgepodge. They have been enacted at odd times over a long period of years, and piled one upon the other. They are not part of any integrated or coordinated plan of taxation. They do not adhere uniformly to sound tax principles. Too little consideration has been given to their effect upon taxpayers and the national economy. The Federal and State Governments have gradually encroached upon each other's spheres of taxation, thereby bringing about multiple taxes of the same character.

I share the opinion of many that it is high time we took our Federal tax system apart and rebuilt it along more satisfactory lines. We should endeavor to develop a long-range, well-balanced, equitable, and simplified scheme of taxation which will meet the legitimate revenue needs of the Government without unduly burdening the citizen or business enterprise.

The revision of our tax system is one of our most pressing national problems. It is a subject which is of vital interest to every man, woman, and child, and every business concern in the country. It is said that from death and taxes there is no escape, and this is literally true. Those taxes which we do not pay directly to the tax collector we pay indirectly in the increased cost of goods and services, and the fact is that these unseen or hidden taxes make up the greater share of our present tax burden.

In my resolution, I propose what I conceive to be generally desirable tax policies to guide the Commission in its studies. These policies have received the personal indorsement of the Secretary of the Treasury, as appears from a colloquy which I had with him in the course of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on the 1939 tax bill. I shall ask unanimous consent to include brief extracts from these hearings at the conclusion of my remarks.

Now what are these tax policies which I propose, and which the Secretary of the Treasury has indorsed? I shall refer to them, one by one, and make short comments thereon.

STABLE TAX POLICY NEEDED

First, it is proposed that Congress establish a stable, more permanent Federal tax policy. Right now we do not seem to have any definite tax policy, or if any exists, it certainly is not a very stable one. Every year since 1932 we have had a tax bill of some sort. Whether we have one this year is as yet uncertain. In the last 5 years, corporations have been subjected to five different kinds of taxation—and still we wonder why we have business uncertainty. Under the act of 1934, all corporations paid a flat tax on their net income. In 1935, a graduated corporation income tax was enacted, which was to apply to the taxable year 1936 and subsequent years. In 1936, before any taxes had been collected under the graduated tax, the iniquitous undistributed-profits tax was passed, which completely revolutionized corporate taxation. In 1938, as a result of public criticism, this tax was drastically amended, and we had a graduated income tax on small corporations and a modified undistributed-profits tax on large corporations. The latter tax was superseded last year by a flat tax on net income. Business can usually adjust itself to any reasonable burden if it knows what it is going to be, but it is this constant change and fear of further change that has in a large measure contributed to the present state of uncertainty. If we adopt a fixed tax policy, we can adjust the rates upward or downward to meet changing revenue needs.

BURDENSOME TAXES SHOULD BE AVOIDED

Second, it is proposed that we raise the necessary revenue for the support of the Government with the least possible burden on individual taxpayers and business enterprises. While taxes are a necessary evil, care should be taken that they do not oppress or unduly burden the taxpayer. This is one of the outstanding purposes of the resolution.

EXCESSIVE RATES CAUSE REVENUE SHRINKAGE

Third, it is proposed that due regard be given to the natural economic law of diminishing returns in fixing tax rates. We have learned by experience that there is a point beyond which a higher rate of taxation produces not more, but less, revenue. In the opinion of many, the upper brackets of the surtax, which take as much as 79 cents out of the taxpayer's dollar, have already reached that point. Excessive taxes not only dry up the sources of revenue, but they tend to drive capital out of productive enterprise, to the great detriment not only of workers but of the Nation as a whole. The President has well stated that excessive taxes

Are reflected in idle factories, tax-sold farms, and * * * in hordes of the hungry tramping the streets and seeking jobs in vain.

During the twenties we found that we could raise more money by reasonable taxes than we could by taxes that stifled business and took too large a share of the purchasing power of the people. We should profit by that example.

TAXES SHOULD BE BASED ON ABILITY-TO-PAY PRINCIPLE

Fourth, it is proposed that Federal taxes be based, insofar as practicable and expedient, upon the principle of ability to pay. We profess to follow that principle, but in practice we do not, except to a very limited extent. The income tax is the outstanding example of this kind of a tax. One of the questions which the proposed commission undoubtedly would consider would be the broadening of the income-tax base. This, of course, is a rather unpopular subject. However, I should expect the Commission, if it made a recommendation along this line, to offset the extension of the income tax to those in the lower-income groups by the elimination of the taxes paid by such groups which are not based on ability to pay. I realize that there are some few taxes of this character, such as those on liquor and tobacco, which from the revenue standpoint probably would have to be continued.

HIDDEN TAXES SHOULD BE ELIMINATED

Fifth, it is proposed that indirect and hidden taxes be eliminated insofar as possible. This principle overlaps the one just mentioned to some extent, but it needs separate recognition. These indirect taxes not only are not based on ability to pay, but their principal vice is that they deceive the taxpayer, particularly the person of small means, as to just how much he is having to pay for what the President has

termed "the luxury of being governed." On November 18, 1937, I presented to the House some studies showing how much persons in various income groups paid per year in the form of hidden taxes. These studies showed that a man with an income of only \$80 per month, who owned neither a home nor a car, paid over \$116 annually to the Federal, State, and local governments in taxes of this kind, which, of course, he did not realize he was paying. The man with \$150-a-month income who owned a second-hand car but no home paid \$229 a year in hidden taxes. It was found that 25 cents out of every dollar paid to the landlord for rent went to reimburse him for taxes assessed against the property. The hidden tax in every dollar paid for food is 7 cents, for clothing 8 cents, for fuel and light 9½ cents, for transportation by automobile 20 cents, for recreation 10 cents, and so on. A large part of the price of everything a man buys is represented by hidden taxes of one kind or another.

According to official Treasury estimates, over 60 percent of the Federal tax collections come from taxes of this character. Because so many of our taxes are hidden, persons of small means, who are not subject to the income tax, are led to believe that they are paying nothing to the support of the Government, when as a matter of fact they are actually contributing the greater share of the total tax burden. If we would bring Federal taxes out into the open, so that each person would know how much he is contributing to the cost of government, we would soon get back to a sane spending program. Only when the people are tax conscious will they become expenditure conscious as well.

SIMPLIFICATION NEEDED

Sixth, it is proposed that efforts be made to simplify the Federal-tax system, including the forms of taxation, the statement of the law, and the methods of administration. Everyone knows that our present tax laws are a headache for taxpayers, and a bonanza for tax lawyers and accountants. There is room for much work to be done along the line of simplification. It has been said that we cannot have simple tax laws applying to the complexities of modern business methods, but still we do not have to go out of our way to make the statement of the law unintelligible, or the methods of taxation unnecessarily complicated.

SHOULD ALLEVIATE HARDSHIPS AND INEQUITIES

Seventh, it is proposed to alleviate the hardships and inequities in the application and administration of the tax laws. That these hardships and inequities exist, no one will deny. We should remedy them to the extent that it is possible to do so.

THE PROBLEM OF DOUBLE TAXATION

Eighth, it is proposed to minimize double taxation on the part of the Federal and State Governments. This is one of our most pressing problems, and one which is going to be most difficult of solution. It is worthy of being made the subject of a special study. The commission, however, could at least make recommendations as to how best to proceed in endeavoring to work the problem out.

TAX LOOPHOLES SHOULD BE CLOSED

Ninth, it is proposed that further efforts be made to prevent tax evasion and avoidance. Much work has already been done along this line, but some of the outstanding methods of tax avoidance still remain unremedied. One of these is the community property system which prevails in some nine States, whereby citizens in those States are legally enabled to reduce their Federal income tax by as much as 40 percent.

OTHER DESIRABLE CHANGES

Tenth, it is proposed that the commission suggest such other changes as will improve the Federal-tax system. This is more or less of a basket clause, there being no intention to limit the commission in the scope of its study. Under this heading, the commission could give consideration to such matters as whether it is desirable to recognize capital gains and losses for income-tax purposes, whether dividends should continue to be taxed at the normal rate in the hands of individuals, whether sufficient preference is now given to the treatment of earned, as distinguished from unearned income,

and such other matters as might properly come up in connection with the general tax problem. Any number of matters of this kind could be mentioned.

FEDERAL TAX COMMISSION LONG ADVOCATED BY MANY GROUPS

Under the resolution, the commission would be directed to make such investigations as it deemed necessary or advisable in order to carry out the purposes set forth. It would be directed to report to Congress not later than January 3, 1942, which would give it ample time in which to make its study and formulate its recommendations.

Let me say that the setting up of a nonpartisan Federal tax commission on which various economic groups would be represented has long been advocated by many outstanding organizations and individuals. Among the national organizations favoring such a commission are the American Farm Bureau Federation, the American Federation of Labor, the American Bar Association, the American Institute of Accountants, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Thus agriculture, labor, and industry all unite in the demand for a study such as I provide for in my resolution.

The round table on taxation and recovery, conducted last year by *Fortune* magazine, which was participated in by leading businessmen and tax authorities, unanimously recommended the establishment of a national tax commission, saying in part:

Our first and foremost suggestion is that Congress authorize the appointment of a national tax commission, drawn from among the ablest men in public and private life, to take evidence from every competent source, and recommend the adoption of such principles and methods of administration as would remove much of the present complexity and uncertainty.

Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, one of the elder statesmen of the Democratic Party, said, in testifying before the Senate Committee on Unemployment and Relief in 1938:

Revision of Federal and State tax structures for maximum business activity and at the same time maximum revenue on the law of diminishing returns requires study. I am not here making specific recommendations except as to principles. But I believe that an open hearing in a deliberate inquiry by a mixed commission where economic as well as political tax experts could be heard, could make proposals much improving the present tax structure, and it is hard to excuse our delay in doing that. It is a matter of public concern and pretty near first magnitude. If there is such a thing as science in government, this is where it should be applied. The Treasury is no place for the theories of political messiahs.

One of the organizations which has taken a most prominent part in advocating the creation of a Federal tax commission is the American Institute of Accountants. Tax lawyers and accountants come in direct contact with the problems which taxpayers meet in the application of the law and its administration by the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the courts. The Committee on Federal Taxation of the American Institute of Accountants, in a report made a little over 2 years ago, stated:

For many years the determination of sound principles of Federal taxation has been urged. Treasury emergency and political expediency have combined to defer this objective. The administration could do not one thing of greater importance to assure the future stability of business than to bring about the creation of a qualified nonpartisan commission to conduct the research required for the unbiased determination of fixed principles of Federal income taxation. The most confusing and perilous factor confronting those who chart the course of business today is that of taxation. Much of the uncertainty could be removed.

Since that time this organization has continued to advocate such a commission, and in its most recent report, dated September 18, 1939, states in part:

Official recognition has already been given in this country to the proposal for a qualified nonpartisan tax commission. Representative TREADWAY having introduced in the last two sessions of Congress joint resolutions providing for the creation of such a commission. Although these resolutions failed of legislative consideration, they should be revived and aggressively championed. . . . The real solution of our national tax dilemma awaits the appointment of an unbiased national tax commission, comprising individuals drawn from business, labor, government, and professional circles, who have a well-grounded knowledge of tax matters.

PROPOSED COMMISSION WOULD HAVE BROAD REPRESENTATION

In my resolution I have proposed a commission of 10 members, which is about as small a number as can reasonably be provided for and still give broad representation. There would be 4 congressional members and 6 representing the public. I have provided for 2 congressional members from each branch, 1 representing the majority party and 1 the minority party, in keeping with the nonpartisan character of the commission. Of the 6 public members 1 would be representative of agriculture, 1 of labor, 1 of business and industry, 1 of individual taxpayers and consumers, 1 of tax lawyers and accountants, and 1 of tax economists. These members would be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. They would constitute a majority of the commission.

The chief criticism of past tax studies is that they have never been very thorough, and in no instance has the public had any representation. They have been conducted by the revenue committees of the Congress working in conjunction with the Treasury. Of course, those who write the tax laws are naturally somewhat prejudiced in favor of their own handiwork. There has been too little sympathy with the viewpoint and problems of those who have to pay the tax bill. Every organization which has endorsed the proposal for a Federal tax commission has called attention to this fact and urged that interests and viewpoints be represented.

Since the introduction of my resolution two other Members of the House have introduced similar measures, namely, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. This is evidence of the increasing interest in the matter. This is strictly a nonpartisan proposition, and I do not see how there can be any objection to it.

PROPOSED STUDY ALREADY TOO LONG DELAYED

We have already waited too long to undertake a complete overhauling of the Federal tax structure, which, as nearly everyone concedes, is much to be desired. The creation of a Federal tax commission would enable us to establish a more sound, more equitable, more understandable, and more productive tax system, and obviate the necessity for frequent changes in the forms and incidence of taxation. With our revenue problem as grave as it now is, there is all the more reason why this study should be undertaken. Before imposing any new taxes, we ought to know exactly where we stand and where and how far we can go for new revenue without "killing the goose." [Applause.]

EXHIBIT A

House Joint Resolution 35

Joint resolution establishing a Federal Tax Commission, and for other purposes

Resolved, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress—

- (1) To establish a stable, more permanent Federal tax policy;
- (2) To raise the necessary revenue for the support of the Government with the least possible burden on individual taxpayers and business enterprises;
- (3) To give due regard to the natural economic law of diminishing returns in fixing tax rates;
- (4) To base Federal taxes, insofar as may be practicable and expedient, upon the principle of ability to pay;
- (5) To eliminate, insofar as may be possible, indirect and hidden taxes;
- (6) To simplify the Federal tax system, including the forms of taxation, the statement of the law, and the methods of administration;
- (7) To alleviate hardships and inequities in the application and administration of the internal-revenue laws;
- (8) To minimize double taxation by coordinating the Federal tax system with those of the State and local governments;
- (9) To prevent tax evasion and avoidance; and
- (10) To make such other changes as will improve the Federal internal-revenue system.

Sec. 2. There is hereby established a Federal Tax Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), to be composed of 10 members, as follows:

- (1) Two members who are members of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, one from the majority and one from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee;
- (2) Two members who are members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, one from the majority and one from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee;

(3) Six members (none of whom holds any office in the Government of the United States or is engaged in the activities of any political party), to be chosen by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one of whom shall be a representative of agriculture, one of labor, one of business and industry, one of individual taxpayers and consumers, one of tax lawyers and accountants, and one of tax economists.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the Commission—

(1) To make such investigations as it may deem necessary or advisable in order to carry out the purposes of this resolution;

(2) To publish from time to time, for public examination and analysis, proposed measures for carrying out the policy of Congress herein expressed; and

(3) To report to the Congress from time to time, and in any event not later than January 3, 1942, the results of its investigations, together with such recommendations as it may have to make.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall meet and organize as soon as practicable after at least a majority of the members have been chosen, and shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members, and shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of a secretary and such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as it deems advisable. A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Commission, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection.

(b) The Commission is authorized to hold hearings and to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services in reporting such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. Subpenas for witnesses shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman.

(c) The Commission is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government, of the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and of the office of the Legislative Counsel.

(d) The Commission shall have the same right to obtain data and to inspect returns as the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and to submit any relevant or useful information thus obtained to the Congress.

(e) The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation for such service, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(f) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated so much as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution. Amounts appropriated for the expenses of the Commission shall be disbursed by the Division of Disbursements, Treasury Department, upon vouchers approved by the chairman or vice chairman.

(g) All authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate on the expiration of 3 years from the enactment of this resolution.

EXHIBIT B

COMMENTS OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY MORGENTHAU ON TREADWAY RESOLUTION

(Extracts from hearings before Ways and Means Committee on revenue bill of 1939)

Mr. TREADWAY. In view of the fact that you suggest the creation of a small commission, don't you think that there are serious questions involved in the whole tax picture that would deserve an investigation by a nonpartisan commission?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. Well, Mr. TREADWAY, I made this suggestion in order to raise a question which I think is a very important one. And just how Congress, in its wisdom, will handle it, naturally I will leave to them. But ever since I have been in the Treasury I have felt that this question of overlapping taxes is one of the important ones, and I take the liberty of bringing this to the attention of Congress so that you really might do something about it.

Mr. TREADWAY. Well, the modesty of Mr. JENKINS leads me to exhibit a similar modesty, but I call your attention to a measure which I introduced in two Congresses. In the last Congress I introduced a resolution, and repeated it in the Seventy-sixth Congress, extending this Commission's study on a broader scale than what you are suggesting here. Therefore, I would like to ask that House Joint Resolution 35 of the Seventy-sixth Congress also be given the attention of your experts, wherein it is stated:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress—

"(1) To establish a stable, more permanent Federal tax policy."

You would agree that that is desirable, would you not?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then, in the second place—

"To raise the necessary revenue for the support of the Government with the least possible burden on individual taxpayers and business enterprises."

I take it this very statement you are making to us this morning is along that very line, is it not?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. I think both aims are laudable.

Mr. TREADWAY. Thank you. Then—

"(3) To give due regard to the natural economic law of diminishing returns in fixing tax rates."

You would approve of that, would you not?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY (reading):

"(4) To base Federal taxes, insofar as may be practicable and expedient, upon the principle of ability to pay."

That is a good policy of the Government, is it not?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. Excellent.

The CHAIRMAN. It sounds like the Democratic platform.

Mr. KNUTSON. It does sound like it, but Mr. TREADWAY wants to carry it into effect.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then—

"(5) To eliminate insofar as may be possible indirect and hidden taxes."

Is there anything worse in our whole tax program than hidden taxes?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. I think we can agree on that.

Mr. TREADWAY (reading):

"(6) To simplify the Federal tax system, including the forms of taxation, the statement of the law, and the methods of administration."

Those are all laudable purposes, are they not?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. Very.

Mr. TREADWAY (reading):

"(7) To alleviate hardships and inequities in the application and administration of the internal-revenue laws."

That is a good doctrine?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY (reading):

"(8) To minimize double taxation by coordinating the Federal tax system with those of the State and local governments."

That is exactly what you are recommending, is it not, in this small board you recommend setting up?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. Yes, sir.

Mr. TREADWAY. So that you approve of that?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. Yes, sir.

Mr. TREADWAY (reading):

"(9) To prevent tax avoidance."

That is the objective of all of us?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. It is.

Mr. TREADWAY. And—

"(10) To make such other changes as will improve the Federal internal-revenue system."

Secretary MORGENTHAU. Fine.

Mr. TREADWAY. Those are the declarations of policy. Then this modest bill of mine, timidly offered for your comment at this time, goes on to set up a Commission composed of two members of the Senate Finance Committee, two members of the Ways and Means Committee, and six members, none of whom hold any office in the Government of the United States or are engaged in activities of any political party, to be chosen by the President.

Secretary MORGENTHAU. Very good.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is a good board, isn't it?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. It sounds very good to me.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then, so far as I can see—the rest of it is more or less detail, method of procedure, and so on—so far as I can gather from your responses to my inquiries, you and I are in hearty accord as to the desirability of setting up such a nonpartisan commission.

Secretary MORGENTHAU. If I again might answer, it seems that you and Mr. JENKINS, the President, and I are all in accord.

Mr. TREADWAY. It looks very like it, and I am very glad to have you come around to our way of thinking.

EXHIBIT C

[Editorial appearing in the Journal of Accountancy, July 1939]

TAX REFORM

The American Institute of Accountants committee on Federal taxation has repeatedly stated its conviction that the first step toward placing the Federal tax system on a sound and equitable basis should be the creation of a qualified nonpartisan commission to establish fixed principles of income taxation and related administrative procedure. Shortly before adjournment of the Seventy-fifth Congress Representative TREADWAY, of Massachusetts, introduced a resolution which embodied the substance of the institute committee's proposal. In doing so Mr. TREADWAY quoted the committee's recommendations on the floor of the House of Representatives. Since no action was taken at that session of the Congress, the resolution was still pending when the 1939 session convened. Until recently there seemed little likelihood that it would receive serious consideration. On May 27, however, the prospect changed. The Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House on that day to discuss tax revision. He recommended that a temporary national committee be established to study all forms of taxation and to recommend improvements in the tax structure as a whole. Congressman TREADWAY, in colloquy with the Secretary, read the aims and purposes of the resolution and obtained from him an expression of complete agreement with each. Mr. Morgenthau further agreed to have the Treasury Department make a thorough study of the resolution and report to Congress on it.

Provisions of the resolution itself, which is known as House Joint Resolution 35, were described fully in the Journal of Accountancy

for July 1938. We cannot imagine any basis for disagreement with the proposals advanced by Mr. TREADWAY, and we believe that this is an issue to which the accountancy profession will wish to summon its full support.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GIFFORD. Is not the gentleman fearful that the make-up of that commission would do more harm than good under the present administration, having in mind the T. N. E. C. appointments? In the end you might get a recommendation far different than the gentleman would expect. Is it not better to wait a little while?

Mr. TREADWAY. I have waited for 2 years to even have a hearing on this measure.

Mr. GIFFORD. Does the gentleman trust the President to appoint these members?

Mr. TREADWAY. The President of the United States ought to be—and I think I can say must be—interested in the welfare of his fellow citizens. I cannot conceive of a man competent to fill the office of President of the United States, to whatever party he may belong, endeavoring to set up a board having to do with the individual interests of every citizen of the country that would not treat those divisions that I spoke of fairly. I may have a little more regard for the present incumbent of the White House than the gentleman from Cape Cod.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am reading the hearings before the T. N. E. C., and many of those men—all those enthusiastic new dealers have been appointed 90 percent of the time, and 90 percent of the doctrine placed before them is of these New Deal schemes. I do not think the gentleman would be happy at all with any report that could come from a commission appointed at this time.

Mr. TREADWAY. Well, it is such an important subject that there should not be any undue delay in anticipation of a change of administration. I am not going to take up the question of partisanship in connection with this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. I think the subject matter is too important to become involved in a discussion of the question of partisanship.

While I asked the Treasury Department on March 6 for a formal report on my resolution, none has been received up to this time. However, as I have pointed out, the Secretary has personally endorsed the proposal, so he is already on record.

I may say that I have requested the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to hold hearings on the measure, but no action has as yet been taken on my request. However, he has discussed the matter with me informally, and I hope and trust that a favorable decision will be reached. I realize that it is difficult for a Republican Member to secure consideration of a measure when the Democratic Party is in control, but in view of the fact that my proposal is strictly nonpartisan and is one in which every person in the country has a vital interest, it would seem that the Democratic majority on the Ways and Means Committee might properly join in the nonpartisan spirit and permit public hearings to be held on the resolution. Then if my colleague wants to change the formation of the Commission, there is no pride of authorship so far as I am concerned. I shall be only too glad to have the benefit of his advice in submitting to the Ways and Means Committee a formal measure. I would say further that the measure I am introducing, of course, is only something to have before the committee, as the expression goes, to shoot at.

Mr. GIFFORD. If the gentleman will yield further, I can only remark that the present President is the only President we have. We cannot avoid having him make those appointments. The gentleman could not possibly change his resolution to avoid that.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am not so sure that we cannot have a satisfactory commission. While I realize that my colleague is rather steeped in good old-fashioned conservative Repub-

licanism—and I do not think I need take a back seat from him on that score myself—nevertheless I am willing to show that much confidence at least in whoever may be President of the United States. My thought is we want this study made. The country cannot go along under a different tax bill year after year. We need some permanent basis on which to set up taxation. I feel very strongly, therefore, that some measure of this kind ought to be passed. The first point, of course, is to have a hearing on it.

I thank the Committee for its indulgence.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a copy of the resolution I have introduced, some excerpts from a hearing before the Ways and Means Committee in which Mr. Morgenthau testified, and an editorial from an accounting magazine.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair reminds the gentleman from Massachusetts that he will have to obtain such permission in the House.

Mr. TREADWAY. I do not think I shall have to obtain permission to insert the resolution, shall I?

The CHAIRMAN. Permission must be secured in the House for the insertion of extraneous matter.

Mr. TREADWAY. But, Mr. Chairman, I submit this resolution is not extraneous, for it is one that I am proposing.

Mr. Chairman, I submitted three different requests, none of which, in my opinion, relate to extraneous matter under the rule. One is the resolution itself that I have introduced. I could read that in my own time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises the gentleman that the Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that permission to insert the matter referred to by the gentleman should be obtained in the House.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE.]

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I realize, in saying what I am about to say, that I may tread on a lot of toes.

Mr. Chairman, I have been here in the capital of the United States now for some 7 years and have been giving considerable thought to the policies and programs of the people in control of the city and the building up of this great civic center, and the working out of those policies. I was very much interested in watching in a recent news release on the screen the act of demolishing an apartment house here in Washington to make way for the new War Department Building. As I study the city of Washington the first thing I would say in describing the city is that it is built a good deal like an egg. An egg is dark in the middle and white around the edges. I think Washington fits that description, for in the very heart of the city, down Florida Avenue and southward of it west to Sixteenth Street, it is pretty dark in complexion. I am giving some thought to this condition.

In thinking of this matter of the location of the new War Department Building, I often wonder why the powers that be put it where they did. I am wondering why the great investment was made in locating the building to house the munitions branch of the War and Navy Department in a swamp where we must use sandbags to barricade any excessive rise in the Potomac River. I am wondering why we have a \$50,000 fountain in the shadow of the Capitol yet flanked by some of the most miserable slums to be found anywhere. I am wondering why the beautiful street laid out by the man who designed this city, that great French engineer, Pierre Charles L'Enfant, with its beautiful squares and circles, why majestic Pennsylvania Avenue that runs from the Capitol to the Anacostia River, an avenue having four rows of beautiful trees its entire length, is in its present neglected condition. I am wondering why there is no more interest in Congress in the care and upkeep of what was designed to be one of the finest streets in the world, a street that was laid out so broad and wide in the "horse and buggy" days, broken with parked squares, the natural location for fine homes and apartments, why it is in its neglected condition right here in the shadow of the Capitol when we have spent so many millions of dollars in

building the magnificent Supreme Court structure, the Congressional Library, and its magnificent addition, the beautiful office buildings of both branches of the Congress. Why should we have such deplorable conditions along this avenue and in what we call the southeast section of the city, on what is known as Capitol Hill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman know who is responsible for placing the War Department Building where it is, a site which necessitated the tearing down of several apartment buildings, one of which cost \$2,000,000? The naval appropriation bill, as I understand it, will provide for the construction of a building for the Navy Department. They are going to tear down more fine buildings and it seems ridiculous to me to do that. I think the gentleman would do a good thing if he found out who is responsible for such a program.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering why that building is put down there in the swampy section of Washington when the development of the city is taken into consideration, when it is conceivable that some day it may be advisable to have subways around Washington to expedite the handling of Government business. How can you build a subway down in the swamps which are below the level of the Potomac River when we have such a beautiful addition up here on Capitol Hill?

I am told we have a Fine Arts Commission, a zoning commission, and a Park and Planning Commission in Washington. Go out into the northeast and southeast sections of the city and observe the results of their deliberations, their policies, and their plans.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering why we leave these old and antiquated buildings flanking the Supreme Court and flanking the House and Senate Office Buildings, when we are at the same time spending millions of dollars tearing down magnificent apartment buildings in a city in which the rents are so high. In passing I would like to congratulate this city on being one of the few cities of the United States that enjoys two Christmases. I have gone down town and I have seen the Easter holiday crowds. I have never seen in any western or eastern city the stores jammed with people buying useless novelties in the holiday season as I have seen here in Washington during this wonderful Easter holiday. It must be a wonderful thing to be a merchant and to be in business in the capital of the United States with all these high-priced, well-paid civil-service employees, that nobody responsible to the people in the legislative branch of the Government can do anything about their policies, their labor, or the kind of service they give as we find them here in the capital of the United States.

May I suggest to the Park and Planning Commission and the zoning commission and the Fine Arts Commission that it might be worth while to take into consideration that some day we may want a better means of transportation and access to the several departments in the city of Washington. We lose a great deal of time getting to these departments and back here. It is very costly to the Government and to the Members. I am wondering why we could not locate these buildings somewhere around the Capitol of the United States and run a subway, as we have between the House and Senate Office Buildings and the Capitol, and have a quick, inexpensive means of transportation and a compact arrangement where these buildings would be located conveniently to doing the business of the Government rather than having them in some other sections away from the Capitol to boom real estate prices. I am wondering what the Planning Commission and the zoning commission is doing about that?

You know in this day and age people demand conveniences. They are not interested in living in some three-story building where they do not have janitor service, a telephone

exchange, or elevators. How in the world can a property owner give those accommodations under the rules and regulations of our wonderful zoning commission? The plans of this zoning commission and the restrictions it puts on the development of this city make for the dark section in the central part of Washington. People go out where they can have unrestricted building designs and building plans. They abandon this central section. There is no way to replace these old, obsolete buildings under the rules of the zoning commission. What do you find? You find that the Capitol of the United States is inhabited by a class that is not progressive, by a class that is destructive to the development of this city. If you go down to the Federal Housing Administration and talk to them about improvements, they say "There is an infiltration into that section of undesirable people; we are not making any loans and we are not making any developments there." On whose shoulders is that responsibility? According to my idea it is based on an erroneous idea of this Park and Planning Commission and this wonderful zoning commission which is retarding the development of our Capital City and building up outlying districts in Maryland and Virginia. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. RICH.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Idaho, who just preceded me [Mr. WHITE], seems greatly perturbed at some of the things that are happening in Washington by the New Deal administration. I am not surprised at anything that happens nowadays by this Congress, because I am expecting most anything. I have seen so much happen here in the last 10 years since I have been in Washington that most anything can happen and it would not surprise me at all—some good, but more bad than good, I must admit. If the worst comes to the worst, we have an administration that is responsible. Promises versus performances. The promises were not carried out. Why?

First, let me call the attention of these people, Members of Congress who are surprised, to the Democratic platform of 1932. Among other things it stated:

We favor maintenance of the national credit by a Federal Budget annually balanced on the basis of accurate Executive estimates with revenues raised by a system of taxation levied on the principle of ability to pay.

That is a good plank for any platform.

Now, let me call attention to the deficits of this administration since 1934. In 1934 the deficit was \$3,255,393,297; in 1935, \$3,782,966,360; in 1936, \$4,952,928,957; in 1937, \$3,252,539,719; in 1938, \$1,449,625,881; and last year \$3,600,514,404. This year it will approach close to \$4,000,000,000. Some deficits!

What does this mean? I hold in my hand a Treasury statement of March 26. Since last July we have gone into the red to the extent of \$2,667,639,483.12, notwithstanding the fact that our internal-revenue collections this year were 30 percent above those of last year.

They have all been applied to this deficit up to this time. That means that in 270 days you have been going in the red at the rate of \$9,880,150 a day. It means that every hour of the day you are going in the red \$411,700, and for every minute of the day you are going in the red \$6,861, after the promises this administration made when they were seeking election by the American people—8 long years on the road to bankruptcy; 8 long years of terrible deficits.

But that is not all. I could recite to you many, many times just what the President of the United States said when he was seeking election and what he said after he came into office asking for economy in government. Let me call your attention to the fact that on March 10, 1933, the President presented a message to the House of Representatives and the Senate in which he said:

The Nation is deeply gratified by the immediate response given yesterday by the Congress to the necessity for drastic action to restore and improve our banking system. A like necessity exists

with respect to the finances of the Government itself which requires equally courageous, frank, and prompt action.

For 3 long years the Federal Government has been on the road toward bankruptcy.

For the fiscal year 1931 the deficit was \$462,000,000.

For the fiscal year 1932 it was \$2,472,000,000.

For the fiscal year 1933 it will probably exceed \$1,200,000,000.

For the fiscal year 1934, based on the appropriation bills passed by the last Congress and the estimated revenues, the deficit will probably exceed \$1,000,000,000 unless immediate action is taken.

Thus we shall have piled up an accumulated deficit of \$5,000,000,000.

He was speaking about the former administration, and when we remember that his administration is in its eighth year and has piled up a deficit of over \$25,000,000,000, I wonder what he thinks about it. Mr. Hoover was only one-fifth as extravagant as Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I cannot yield now. I will yield when I finish this statement.

Let me quote further from this message of President Roosevelt:

With the utmost seriousness, I point out to the Congress the profound effect of this fact upon our national economy. It has contributed to the recent collapse of our banking structure. It has accentuated the stagnation of the economic life of our people. It has added to the ranks of the unemployed. Our Government's house is not in order, and for many reasons no effective action has been taken to restore it to order.

Upon the unimpaired credit of the United States Government rest the safety of deposits, the security of insurance policies, the activity of industrial enterprises, the value of our agricultural products, and the availability of employment. The credit of the United States Government definitely affects these fundamental human values. It therefore becomes our first concern to make secure the foundation. National recovery depends upon it.

Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on rocks of loose fiscal policy. We must avoid this danger.

It is too late for a leisurely approach to this problem. We must not wait to act several months hence. The emergency is accentuated by the necessity of meeting great refunding operations this spring.

We must move with a direct and resolute purpose now. The Members of Congress and I are pledged to immediate economy.

I am therefore assuming that you and I are in complete agreement as to the urgent necessity, and my constitutional duty is to advise you as to the methods for obtaining drastic retrenchment at this time.

I am not speaking to you in general terms. I am pointing out a definite road.

That is the statement the President made in his message to the Congress on March 10, 1933, and ever since that time he has been doing exactly what he promised the people of this country he would not do, before he was elected and after he was elected. He sure did get off the road.

The gentleman who just preceded me seemed to be very much agitated about what is happening in the Capital. I am very much agitated about what Congress has done and what the Congress is going to do. Ever since January we have seen newspaper headlines to the effect that the Congress of the United States was going to economize. We have seen the Senate of the United States pass a resolution asking that a joint committee of the House and the Senate be established to try to get together to work out things on a good, sound business basis. The Senate passed the resolution but the House has taken no action whatever on it. What is the result? They are just going hog wild, in appropriations and expenditures; they are just running in the red, as I stated awhile ago, at the rate of almost \$8,000 a minute, and no head of this Government is trying to do anything to stop it. Neither the Speaker of the House nor the majority leader or any of the chairmen of the various committees have got together to try to work out a plan whereby they could make revenues equal outgo. They are piling up this deficit on the heads of the children of oncoming generations. If we cannot meet the situation in this day, how are our children going to be able to meet the situation? If you have a boy or a girl in your house, you know what they are confronted with. It is either bankruptcy or ruin, unless we change the conditions as they are at the present time.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman ought to be fair to the President. The President wanted to abolish this debt—he said he did. I think he is abolishing it, do not you? You know, this thing we once called debt the New Deal has transformed into a credit.

Mr. RICH. They have taken jack rabbits out of the hat ever since they have been in office, and the people of this country should realize it by this time. If they ever put Mr. Roosevelt back in office again we will lose our form of Government, because he does not know how to run it. For 7 years he has been trying. Nine million men were unemployed when he came into office and now, in the eighth year of his administration, 9,000,000 men are unemployed, and the Government is going further into the red and the situation is getting worse every minute of the day. Why does he not do as he promised he would do.

Let me read to you what the President of the United States said before his election. You see if this is not a sound statement, and then see what a back flipper he has turned out to be.

We are not getting an adequate return for the money we are spending in Washington; or, to put it another way, we are spending altogether too much money for Government services that are neither practical nor necessary. And then, in addition to that, we are attempting too many functions. We need to simplify what the Federal Government is giving to the people.

I accuse the present administration—

He was speaking then about the former administration—of being the greatest spending administration in peacetimes in all our history. It is an administration that has piled bureau on bureau, commission on commission, and has failed to anticipate the dire needs and the reduced earning power of the people. Bureaus and bureaucrats, commissions and commissioners have been retained at the expense of the taxpayer.

He said this in his speech at Sioux City, Iowa, on September 29, 1932.

Now, let me show you what that gentleman in the White House has done since he has been in office, and this is a terrible situation. He has set up 31 major functions of government, and he has no less than 1,476 subsidiary organizations and corporations administered by these 31 great functions of Government; and what has been the result?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield? Let me tell the gentleman what he promised.

Mr. RICH. We all know what he promised; but can you show me where he carried out his promises?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did you read this one:

It is my pledge and promise that this dangerous kind of financing shall be stopped and that rigid governmental economy shall be fostered by a stern and unrelenting administration policy of living within our income.

Do you remember that one?

Mr. RICH. Well, he has always been long on promises but short on performance. Just let me give you one illustration. Since George Washington took office up to the present administration, which includes all the five wars and the great World War, our receipts were \$91,586,076,130. Since Mr. Roosevelt took office, less than 8 years ago, he received \$40,089,857,957. He received 43 percent of all the moneys that were received since the beginning of this Government. Now, what did he do in the way of expenditures?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I cannot yield until I give you this information, and you ought to know what this is, too. [Laughter.]

Since George Washington and up to the time Mr. Roosevelt took office, the country spent \$112,203,367,065. Since Mr. Roosevelt took office on March 4, 1933, or less than 8 years ago, he has spent \$65,628,526,692, which is 58 percent of all the money we have received from the time of George Washington up to the present day. Think of it! All the debts, including all the five wars, amounted to \$20,617,290,935 when he took office. Since he has been in office he has spent \$25,538,668,735 more than we received and put us in the red to that extent. This means that the national debt, which

was \$22,538,672,164 when he came into office, is now over \$44,938,577,622, about 100-percent increase, and that includes all the assets that he has figured 100 cents on the dollar in the great number of corporations we have established in this country during his administration; and what will be the result when we go to liquidate those corporations that he has established? You know and I know we have many corporations with assets figured 100 cents on the dollar, and we will take a dreadful loss when they are liquidated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the gentleman's sincere desire for economy. The gentleman in his speech a moment ago mentioned the creation, I believe, under the Roosevelt administration of some 32 new departments of government. I am wondering if the gentleman will inform the House, in his own service during the Roosevelt administration, just how many of these agencies the gentleman voted against creating.

Mr. RICH. I voted against pretty nearly everything that this administration brought up except the Economy Act, and I was very badly fooled on that, because I thought that the President of the United States, when he brought in the Economy Act, was going to do what he said he would do; but he fooled and humbugged the people until in March 1934, when he asked for \$4,880,000,000 in House Joint Resolution 117, and section 6 of that resolution read something like this: Anyone criticizing the administration or the handling of this fund will be fined \$5,000 or imprisoned for 2 years. I made up my mind then that the President of the United States wanted to be a dictator or he would never have had that language put in a bill, and I left him then and have had little confidence in him since. I believe in honesty and thrift.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield just for a question.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I would like to discuss—

Mr. RICH. No; you cannot discuss; make it a question.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I find myself more in accord with the gentleman on his criticism of the spending program—

Mr. RICH. I thank the gentleman very much. I cannot yield any further. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. RICH. I cannot yield further. Lots of Democrats tell me that they are in accord with me in economy, but when it comes to voting they always do the opposite; they vote money out of an empty Treasury.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I want to develop the position of the gentleman on spending. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RICH. I cannot yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania declines to yield.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, let me call attention to what has been doing this session of Congress. Notwithstanding the fact that the House said they were going to be for economy, and the Senate said that they were going to be for economy, and this is a New Deal House and a New Deal Senate, yet Congress has appropriated to date as follows:

Agriculture (passed the Senate).....	\$922,911,213.00
District of Columbia (reported to the House).....	48,291,717.00
Independent offices (passed the Senate).....	1,139,783,528.00
Interior (passed the House).....	118,578,187.05
Labor—Federal Security (passed the House).....	1,021,639,700.00
Legislative (passed the House).....	23,907,744.00
Navy (passed the House).....	965,779,438.00
State, Justice, and Commerce (passed the Senate).....	107,079,000.00
Treasury and Post Office (law).....	1,032,801,095.00
War Department, civil (passed the House).....	203,472,567.00
Emergency, supplemental (law).....	252,340,776.00
Urgent deficiency (law).....	57,541,300.00
First deficiency (passed the Senate).....	91,533,408.52

A grand total of..... 5,985,659,673.57

¹ In addition, \$90,000,000 made available from R. F. C. funds.

You have spent \$5,985,659,673.57 to date. Let me call your attention to the total receipts of last year, 1939, \$5,667,823,625. That means that you have already appropriated more than \$300,000,000—more than you took in in 1939 in taxes. The estimated receipts of the President for 1940 are \$5,703,795,000. There are other appropriation bills to come before the House. There will be the relief bill, and what is going to be the result next year? You promised faithfully and every one of you fellows that went in on the platform in 1932 told the people of this country that you were going to have a balanced Budget. I realize that you cannot balance the Budget at once, but you are not making any honest effort to do anything. That is what burns me up. You are not making an honest effort to cut down expenses. You could do a whole lot if you wanted to do it or desired to do it. And it is a shame that you do not. You ought to try to get a business organization here for Government operation. The great difficulty is that there is no leadership, there is no organization, because, if there was, you would not do what you have done here this week in spending. All we seem to do is appropriate money. We had a bill up here on Monday of this week to bring taxes in for the District of Columbia. When we had this present District of Columbia appropriation bill under consideration in the Appropriations Committee the other day I asked the chairman of the subcommittee whether he tried in any manner to cooperate with the District Committee, to find out just what taxes would be necessary in order that they might balance the budget for the District of Columbia.

To my surprise he said they did not need any additional taxes in the District of Columbia. I then asked whether that was the reason why they voted against the tax bill last week. I asked that in good faith, and I thought to myself that I had better talk to the mayor of the city and get his reaction to the tax bill and why it was brought in here if it was not needed. So I went to the mayor of the city, Mr. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, a mighty fine fellow, and I said to him, "Mr. Mayor, what did you bring this tax bill in for? The Appropriations Committee says that you do not need any money or any additional taxes." He stated the tax experts of the District said it was necessary. Whom am I to believe? Why did not the Appropriations Subcommittee and the District Committee get together? That is the point I want to make. Why does not the Speaker of the House call the majority leader and the chairmen of the various committees into conference, to get together on good orderly business procedure, and try to find out what our income is and what the outgo will be, and what deficit we are going to pile up on the children of the oncoming generations? What are we going to do to protect this Nation? What are we going to do to save America?

Mr. President, why not carry out your promises of economy? Why not cut out unnecessary functions of Government as you promised? Why not have economy in Government as you promised? For the sake of our children and our country, if you do not soon get away from this program of ruthless spending, we will go bankrupt and we will lose our form of government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, you will recall the Pelley-Dies letter affair in which David D. Mayne, under oath before the Dies committee and before the Rules Committee, admitted the crime of forgery. He also admitted perjury and selling these letters for money to fool certain persons and in order, in his own words, to "put them out on a limb." Gardner Jackson and Harold Misberg, under sworn complaint before the United States district attorney, charged Mayne with perjury, forgery, obtaining money under false pretenses, and conspiring with unknown persons to violate a Federal statute. A grand jury was empaneled and listened to testimony concerning this affair. The investigation was conducted by David A. Pine, United States district attorney for the District of Columbia, assisted by Mr. Wilson, assistant district attorney. That jury, after deliberation and after

hearing the assistant district attorney, has reported and failed to indict this self-confessed perjurer and forger, even though I am further informed that David Mayne refused to testify before the grand jury, giving as his reason that his testimony might incriminate him. I thought it might be interesting for you to know now that it is not considered a crime in the District of Columbia to commit forgery or perjury.

The grand jury, not having brought out an indictment of forgery against David D. Mayne who, under oath before the Dies committee and the Rules Committee, testified he forged the letters, any reasonable person must come to the conclusion that they must have based their decision on the fact that the letters were not forged but genuine. If the letters are genuine, according to the action of the grand jury, then, of course, they should be replaced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because they were taken out after David D. Mayne testified that he forged them.

Is this action on the part of the United States District Attorney David A. Pine, and his assistant, Mr. Wilson, to be construed to mean that the so-called Pelley letters were not forged?

I know that the people of this Nation are still in a quandary about the Pelley-Mayne affair before the Dies committee. Pelley, whose aims are admittedly the same as the Dies committee, is still at large. David Mayne, who was employed by the Dies committee, the perpetrator of these crimes, is now free. I wonder why? You can use your own imagination as to what must have happened, because David D. Mayne is reported to have boasted of protection by the Dies committee and its investigators. William Dudley Pelley, in his publication, *Liberation*, several weeks ago, carried the story that Mayne was entitled to protection from the Dies committee. Probably a resolution for a special committee to investigate this whole affair would be in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not get the drift of it. What is the complaint? Is it that Mayne is not being prosecuted?

Mr. HOOK. Yes; that is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What crime did he commit?

Mr. HOOK. Was not the gentleman before the Rules Committee, and did he not hear the evidence?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understand that Mayne—

Mr. HOOK. Forged letters.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. HOOK. Perjured himself and obtained money under false pretenses.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, just a moment. I do not know anything about obtaining money under false pretenses, but I am getting at this matter of perjury and forgery. There cannot be forgery unless it is in connection with some judicial proceeding. I do not hold any brief for Mayne, but what is the specific crime that you want Mayne indicted for?

Mr. HOOK. I mentioned all of them. The testimony has gone before the grand jury.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not critical, now, as the gentleman may think.

Mr. HOOK. That is up to the grand jury.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I do.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us why the various district attorneys have not prosecuted the 22 indictments for income-tax frauds in Louisiana and why they have not prosecuted the indictments against Smith and Shushan for selling W. P. A. jobs, which were handed down last summer in New York City?

Mr. HOOK. If I were United States District Attorney, I could answer the gentleman, but I am not, and I am not a mind reader nor a crystal gazer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to state that personally I appreciate the painstaking labor which

has been given to the District of Columbia appropriation bills by Members charged with that responsibility. The gentleman from Florida, Chairman CALDWELL, has done a good job, and I commend him and his fellow subcommittee members. Theirs is not an easy task. Of course, they are only face to face with District problems once a year, whereas those of us who serve on the legislative committee for the District of Columbia in this House are face to face with those problems practically every day, and at least every week, during the sessions of Congress.

I feel that there is an obligation on my shoulders this afternoon to briefly discuss the need in the District of Columbia for giving bona fide residents in the United States Capital City the right and responsibility of franchise. I am well aware that there is a difference of opinion on this subject, and I know the arguments which are raised about suffrage for voteless citizens who live in this jurisdiction. I have weighed all of the arguments for and against, that I am able to study and inquire into, and my opinion on this matter is strengthened each year that I serve in Washington. I believe these are at least three local newspapers—the Star, the Post, and the Times-Herald, who editorially are fighting for the vote here. I feel more and more inclined to energetically, on every opportunity, speak in behalf of suffrage for the District of Columbia. I think it is significant that the distinguished and able chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, Judge SUMNERS, of Texas, a man who has had long and faithful service in this body, after studying this question, has seen fit, in the last few months, to introduce a resolution which would call for national representation for the District of Columbia. I am told that there was a time when Judge SUMNERS, of Texas, did not believe there was need for suffrage here, but I know that the very introduction of the resolution by that legislator has come about through a growing conviction that he believe the cause is just. I regret that I, myself, and others have not been able, through legislative means, to bring this matter to the floor of Congress for debate, discussion, and vote.

I feel keenly that the 250,000 men and women who reside in Washington and can claim no bona fide residence in any State do not possess the responsibility and the inherent right to exercise their vote for President of the United States and for representation in both Houses of the Congress, and also for some form of local government.

I regret there are not more Members present while we are considering the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and, without criticism of any Member, I only wish the debate itself might center more fully around District matters. I say to those who are on the floor this afternoon that I cannot believe we can longer continue in this country to deny bona fide residents the privilege of voting in Washington, D. C. I do not feel that there is a section of America where the processes of democracy should not be fully at work. I hope Members of Congress will give more thought to the subject matter of my remarks.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I cannot help but rise here this afternoon and make a statement of commendation of the District of Columbia Legislative Committee and the District of Columbia Subcommittee on Appropriations. As the gentleman from West Virginia knows, the gentleman from Idaho made a pessimistic review of conditions in the District of Columbia a few moments ago. It seems to me—and I believe the gentleman from West Virginia will agree with me, a gentleman who is referred to from time to time as the mayor of the District—that Congress gets out of the District of Columbia just what it puts into it. We do not put a great deal into it. This is evidenced by the fact that this afternoon there are but a baker's half-dozen on the floor when the District bill is under consideration. It is no easy job to

serve on these District committees. It is common knowledge in the House that when a new Member comes here he tries to shy away from the District Committee because it does not get a Member any votes back home, one must do much additional work, and frequently take a lot of abuse. I believe the legislative committee and the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia deserve the gratitude and thanks of this Congress and the people of the District; but, as I say, Congress gets out of this District just what we put into it. If Congress would pay more attention to the District, such conditions as those complained of would not arise.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. HOOK. The gentleman has made a great study of the question of suffrage for the District of Columbia. Would he inform us whether or not the District of Columbia ever had the right of suffrage, and whether they asked that Congress take it back, and why?

Mr. RANDOLPH. There was a limited suffrage here, but I do not have time to go into that lengthy question.

The present feeling of the residents of the District of Columbia is clearly indicated by the results of a referendum they themselves conducted here on April 30, 1938. They voted before and after working hours. They spent their own money in that election and had no help from any Government agency. Practically 95,000 persons voted—all bona fide residents—and they were in favor of national representation by 9 to 1 and local suffrage by 7 to 1. They went voluntarily to the polls. There were no candidates to transport them there. They went and expressed their opinions on a vital subject. It was one of the most outstanding expressions of genuine public opinion that this Nation has ever seen.

I venture the assertion this afternoon that the time will come when suffrage in local government and national affairs will be granted the residents of the District of Columbia, as it is in the other parts of the Nation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I arise at this time to say a few words to the Members of this House on what to me is one of the most important problems that has been before this House during this session and is now up for discussion and a vote in the Senate either today or not later than Monday.

There are several questions that I would like to have those handling the treaties answer before this power is extended to the President and the Secretary of State to continue to renew these treaties or make new ones.

First of all I would like to know why, after the tariff on cheese had been reduced 2 cents a pound under the first treaty with Canada had been entered into and the dairy farmer had been having a hard time to meet his obligations at that time, another reduction of 1 cent a pound was made in 1938, or a 20 percent reduction when cheese had been selling all that year at an average of 12.6 cents per pound?

Every dairyman knows that cheese at 12.6 cents per pound represents only about two-thirds of the cost of production. The Agriculture Department should have known this and if they did not know, then they should either get someone in the department that does know or discontinue the department having to do with dairy products. We have been paying enough money to the Department that they ought to know. Personally I would like to know who in the Department of Agriculture recommended this reduction of almost 50 percent in the tariff on cheese.

The dairy interests of this country are entitled to consideration the same as those producing other agricultural products, and if they do not get it there is going to be trouble in this country and it is not going to be confined to the dairy interests alone.

If anybody had taken the time to figure the cost of production of cheese and butter, they would have known that the

reduction of the tariff on cheese would kill the industry in time.

In order to do this, I want to give you some figures on our investment in dairy cattle, the amount of dairy products we produce and some values of these products. I would like then to give you some facts and figures on imports and exports of dairy and other products which, either directly or indirectly, affect our daily life.

On January 1, 1939, we had 2,179,000 head of dairy cattle on farms in Wisconsin; Minnesota ranked next with 1,705,000, and Iowa third with 1,472,000 head; Texas fourth with 1,458,000 and New York fifth with 1,423,000 head.

The total milk production for Wisconsin alone in 1938 was 11,862,000,000 pounds and approximately 12,000,000,000 pounds in 1939. This figure for 1938 is about 484,000,000 pounds greater than the State's output in 1937. The average value of dairy cows in Wisconsin on January 1, 1939, was \$69 per head, or a total value of \$150,351,000. The average value per head on January 1, 1938, was \$72. The total value of all dairy cattle in the United States on January 1, 1939, was \$1,397,280,000.

The price of fluid milk during each month of the year 1938 was lower than for the year 1937, and the average loss to the Wisconsin farmers was about \$1,000,000 each month.

In addition to the cheese we produced in the United States in 1937, we imported into this country about 60,000,000 pounds. Under reciprocal trade agreements this meant a loss to the Wisconsin farmers of about \$1,000,000. The price paid to the farmers for livestock in 1938 averaged 12 percent lower than in 1937.

In 1935 the agricultural population of all the United States was placed at 31,800,907. This is about 25 percent of our total population.

The population of the 5 leading dairy States I have named is approximately 6,000,000 people. I figure the farmers raising cotton, corn, and wheat represent about 3.1 percent of our national income and have received millions in subsidies during the last few years. The dairy farmer has received nothing in subsidies.

We were able during the last session of Congress to get one hundred and twenty-five millions to buy surplus commodities, but this was given so the corn, cotton, and wheat growers might get larger amounts in subsidies as well as a substantial portion of the one hundred and twenty-five millions.

The Secretary of Agriculture pleaded with Congress for the one hundred and twenty-five millions to keep farm prices from going lower than in 1932.

The butterfat prices on my own farms between 1922 and 1932 averaged 46 cents per pound. They reached a low of 28 cents per pound in August 1938. I delivered all my milk to cheese factories.

Wisconsin farmers also received agricultural-relief payments made for crop reduction, rental and benefit checks, and payments for conservation of soil resources from 1933 to 1937, \$24,479,202.29. This amount was paid to 18,416 farm families, numbering 78,382 people.

However, with all this help, Federal farm foreclosures in Wisconsin were three times as many in 1938 as in 1936—2 years earlier. The Federal land bank and land bank Commissioner foreclosed 1723 farm mortgages in Wisconsin in 1938, compared with 542 in 1936.

Foreclosures were particularly heavy in northern counties. I shall only call your attention to some counties in my own district, which may be considered the average in the State. Marinette had 5 foreclosures in 1936 and 39 in 1938; Oconto County, 6 in 1936 and 38 in 1938.

In some of the counties in my district where 15 years ago a foreclosure was seldom heard of, we find in 1938 foreclosures in both farm and city; 74 foreclosures in Brown County, Outagamie 88, Manitowoc 116, Oconto 71, Marinette 70, Kewaunee 21, and Door 39.

Now, let us take up and discuss the subject of reciprocal treaties and see if there is any possible casual connection between them and some of the conditions prevailing in the great dairy State of Wisconsin.

First of all I would like to call your attention to the fact that the treaty-making power under the Constitution of the United States rests with the President of the United States and the United States Senate. Subsection (1) of section (2) of article 2 of the United States Constitution provides:

He (the President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

However, in 1934, this power given to the President and the Senate of the United States under the Constitution, was delegated by Congress to the President and Secretary of State, to enter into trade treaties with foreign nations.

Grave doubt exists whether Congress had the right or power to do this, but it has never been tested out in the courts.

This power expires on June 12, 1940, and the question arises, Should it be extended? This will depend upon what the American people think at this time. We have entered into some 24 treaties.

Now, let us see what has happened as a result of these treaties.

Dairymen know that the price of cattle is affected, the price of hogs also; and cream, butter, cheese, and all byproducts of milk.

In order to get a more complete history of our subject, we must go back to 1920-21, when there was a change of administration and Congress passed a farmers' emergency tariff to stop the importation of foreign products which were displacing American products and depressing all prices.

Under this act exports grew from \$3,832,000,000 in 1922 to \$5,241,000,000 in 1929, and our imports from \$3,113,000,000 in 1922 to \$4,339,000,000 in 1939.

In 1933 the present administration came into power, and in 1934 the treaty-making power was transferred as heretofore stated.

Treaties were entered into with Canada and some 23 other countries. I shall not go back to quote you figures, but it will be sufficient to give you some recent figures.

Take the item of cattle. In 1934 we exported 9,968 and imported 59,000 head. In 1935 we exported 3,348 and imported 365,000 head. In 1936 we exported 4,240 and imported 309,000. In 1937 we exported 4,132 and imported 494,945. For the first 9 months of 1938 we imported 295,000 head, and for the year 1939 we exported 2,918 and imported 753,570 head.

Now let us turn to live hogs—they go well with dairying. In 1924 we exported 3,052 head and imported 8,000 pounds of live hogs. If they weighed on an average of 200 pounds to a hog, it would be 400 head.

In 1935 we exported 303 head, but we imported 3,414,000 pounds, or at an average of 200 pounds to a hog, over 17,000 head.

In 1936 we exported 202 head and imported 17,446,000 pounds, or at 200 pounds per head, 87,230 head.

We have heard much about canned meats. In 1934 we exported 16,362,000 pounds and imported 46,781,000 pounds. In 1935 we exported 12,564,000 pounds and imported 76,653,000 pounds. In 1936 we exported 13,348,000 pounds and imported 87,959,000 pounds. In 1937 we exported 13,752,000 and imported 88,087,000, and for the first 8 months of 1939 we exported 83,404,580 pounds and imported 93,228,235 pounds.

Now, let us take up a more interesting article—butter. In 1934 we exported 1,253,000 pounds and imported 1,220,000 pounds. In 1935 we exported 958,000 pounds and imported 22,675,000 pounds. In 1936 we exported 826,000 pounds and imported 9,874,000 pounds. In 1937 we exported 800,000 pounds and imported 11,111,000 pounds, and for the first 8 months of 1939 we exported 1,285,344 and imported 702,500 pounds of butter.

I have saved the most interesting item for the last—cheese. In 1934 we exported 1,377,000 pounds and imported 47,533,000 pounds. In 1935 we exported 1,152,000 pounds and imported 48,923,000 pounds. In 1936 we exported 1,136,000 pounds and imported 59,849,000 pounds. In 1937 we exported 1,156,000 pounds and imported 60,650,000 pounds. For the year 1939 we exported 1,479,689 pounds and imported 59,071,059 pounds.

One item you will be interested in, that of corn. In 1934 we exported 2,987,000 bushels and imported 2,959,000 bushels. In 1935 we exported 177,000 bushels and imported 43,242 bushels. In 1936 we exported 524,000 bushels and imported 31,471,000 bushels. In 1937 we exported 5,834,000 bushels and imported 86,337,000 bushels.

Hay: In 1934 we exported 2,185 tons and imported 23,259; in 1935 we exported 2,718 tons and imported 67,171; in 1936 we exported 2,161 tons and imported 73,976; in 1937 we exported 41,400 tons and imported 146,149.

The farmers and dairymen are interested in their surplus barley, and barley malt, of course, is made from good Wisconsin barley. I find that we exported 25,968,000 pounds of barley malt during the year 1939 and imported 101,130,100 pounds.

Another item that goes into feed of the dairy farmer is that of oats, and I find that we exported 226,142 bushels for the year 1939 and imported 4,293,009 bushels.

I know that you will bear with me for a few minutes if I discuss an item which truly may not be classed as a dairy product but which affects the products of the dairy farmer materially, and that is the fur industry in Wisconsin and throughout the United States. If our fur producers in Wisconsin are prosperous, there is a good deal of money to be spent for dairy products, and if they are bankrupt they can buy just that much less. I find upon investigation, including the silver and black fox, which are very predominant in this State, and also the red fox, and all other kinds, that we exported from this country 43,804 during the first 9 months of 1939, and we imported 556,859. During the same period we exported 148,973 mink skins, and we imported 739,251. These were all undressed furs. Now, the dressed and dyed fox, both silver and black, for the same period, we exported 817 and imported 54,712.

We produce in Wisconsin very high-class furs, while a large majority of furs imported from foreign countries are of a cheaper type. I could go into a number of other articles affecting the dairy farmer, but I feel that I have given you sufficient facts and figures to give you some idea of whether we really are benefited by reciprocal treaties or not. Of course, the sole purpose of entering into these trade treaties was to assure us that our exports would increase decidedly with the countries with which we made the reciprocal treaties over those with which we did not have any treaties. Facts and figures do not bear out these promises, because for the first 9 months of 1939, compared with the first 9 months of 1938, a great increase in agricultural imports into the United States and a great decrease of agricultural exports from the United States has taken place. In the first 9 months of 1939 we imported farm products for consumption in the amount of \$794,700,000, while in the same period in 1938 we purchased farm products in the amount of \$711,600,000. For the same periods our agricultural exports declined from \$602,700,000 in 1938 to \$418,400,000 in 1939.

You can take the item of corn alone. During the first half of 1938, \$30,000,000 of corn was exported to Canada, but less than \$1,000,000 worth was exported in the same period in 1939.

I want to take just a little of your time to cite a few instances comparing the average exports in 1934 and 1935 with 1937 and 1938 to show whether we have been benefited by these trade treaties or not, and to do this I am going to call your attention to countries with whom we have trade agreements and those with whom we do not have any. Let us first turn to Latin America. For instance, in the case of Colombia and Guatemala the exports increased 84 and 18 percent, respectively. These are both treaty countries. However, our exports to Venezuela, a nontreaty country, increased by 161 percent. On November 7, 1939, we signed a trade agreement with Venezuela. Of course, the State Department does not give this information in their releases on the trade treaties.

Now, let us take two other countries, similarly situated—Brazil and Argentina. We have a treaty with the former

but did not have any with the latter until November 6 of last year. Our exports to Brazil, the treaty country, increased 56 percent, but exports to Argentina, a nontreaty country, increased 97 percent.

We will now turn to Europe and see what kind of a comparison we find there. We have a trade treaty with Sweden but not with Norway; yet our exports to Norway increased in almost the same percentage as in the case of Sweden, 80 percent as against 81 percent. Thus, all we got out of the treaty with Sweden, after making numerous concessions to her in the American market at the expense of our own producers, was a 1-percent greater increase in exports than to Norway.

The great conservation program of the Government, which I have always been interested in, but rather doubtful as to any benefits to be gained from it, we have taken out of production 40,000,000 acres of land, and have been paying the farmers for not producing on it, is offset by placing into use some 67,000,000 acres through irrigation and other means of placing land into production.

You may be interested in knowing just how this distribution has been made, and who is getting the money, and the expense connected with the program, which most dairy farmers have participated in. I would not give this to you but it enters into the reciprocal treaty set-up, because it takes out of use land in this country that we could produce the farm products on that are imported into the United States.

During the years 1937 and 1938 there were approximately 6,000,000 farmers in this country participating; 3,657,000 of these farmers and landowners received benefits under the soil-conservation program. About \$315,500,000 was actually spent in payments to the farmers for soil conservation, and \$43,500,000 for administration expense.

If the \$315,500,000 were evenly distributed to those who complied with the soil-conservation plan the average payment would be approximately \$100.

But here are some figures to which I want to direct your particular attention. Out of 3,657,000 farmers 1,091,540, or almost one-third of them, received less than \$20 each. There were 773,000 who received between \$20 and \$40 each; 500,000 who received between \$40 and \$60 each; and 556,000 who got between \$60 and \$100.

If the one-third of all farmers who received less than \$20 annually, averaged as much as \$15 each, and that is a liberal estimate, \$15,000,000 would pay their bill.

If the 774,000 farmers who received between \$20 and \$40 each, received an average of \$30, \$22,000,000 would have paid their contracts.

Then, as to the 500,000 farmers who got less than \$60, if they received an average of \$50 each, \$25,000,000 would pay them.

Then we have 556,000 farmers who received between \$60 and \$100. If their average payment was \$80, and this is liberal, they would have received \$44,480,000.

In other words, with \$107,000,000 we paid approximately 3,000,000 farmers. Or, putting it another way, 80 percent of all the farmers received less than one-half of the funds allocated to the farmers and farm operators. Just think of it, only a comparatively few of the 3,000,000 farmers got as much as \$100. As a matter of fact, they received an average of less than \$50 each.

Furthermore, it took approximately \$18,000,000 to pay the administration expenses in Washington and in the States, and it took \$26,000,000 for county expenses, making a total of \$44,000,000 for administering the fund.

This is more money than was actually paid to 1,880,000 farmers, being more than half of those who participated in the program, and who got less than \$40 each. These farmers received thirty-eight and one-half million dollars, and it took \$44,000,000 to administer the fund.

After deducting the \$107,000,000 which was paid to the 3,000,000 farmers, we have a balance, in round figures, of \$208,000,000, which was divided among the remaining one-fifth of the farmers.

So it would appear that the remaining one-fifth of those who took part in this program in 1937 received approximately \$200,000,000, or two-thirds of the amount actually distributed in soil-conservation payments.

I have given this explanation to you because so many farmers get the idea that they have received, or are receiving, a large amount of money from the Government, while in fact it is a very small amount considering the tremendous increase in the tax burden during the last 10 years. You may be interested in knowing the amount that the State of Wisconsin has received during 1936, 1937, and 1938 for the agricultural-conservation program. In 1936 Wisconsin received \$11,307,000; in 1937, \$8,134,000; and in 1938, \$9,777,000. In 1933-34 the Government, through the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation bought in the open market in round figures \$14,000,000 worth of dairy products for the purpose of supporting dairy prices and distributed them through the relief administration. In 1934-35 between \$5,000,000, and in 1935-36 a similar amount was used for the same purpose. In 1936-37 approximately \$10,000,000 was used in buying the surplus that was weighing down the dairy markets. In 1937-38 this amount was increased to \$15,000,000. And for the current fiscal year, the Government, in order to relieve the market, is setting aside \$4,000,000 for the purchase of fluid milk, \$2,250,000 for the purchase of dry skim milk, and \$26,730,000 for the purchase of butter.

These sums do not include the loans made available to dairy farmers which with the above amounts aggregate an approximate total of \$44,000,000 provided by the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the relief of the dairy industry during this year.

I have given you a number of figures, which I doubt very much you will be able to retain for any great length of time, but they are fresh in your mind now, so let us see if we can find any reason for the great increase in imports of agricultural products into this country since the new treaties have been entered into.

Let us take up the first item—that of cattle. Under the Tariff Act of 1930 those weighing less than 700 pounds imported into this country the tax was 2½ cents per pound; those weighing 700 pounds or more, 3 cents per pound. Under the trade agreements the first item was reduced from 2½ cents to 1½ cents per pound up to 225,000 head.

Hogs, under the Tariff Act of 1930, a tax of 2 cents per pound was imposed for imports. This was reduced under the trade agreements 50 percent, or to 1 cent per pound.

Canned meats, under the Tariff Act of 1930, were 3½ cents per pound for imports, and this was reduced under the trade agreements to 2 cents per pound.

Butter, under the Tariff Act of 1930, there was an import tax of 14 cents per pound. Under the agreement in 1935 this was left at 14 cents, but under the new agreement of November 17, 1938, this was reduced 2 cents a pound and is now 12 cents.

Cheese, under the Tariff Act of 1930, was taxed 7 cents a pound on imports, and under the trade agreement this has been reduced to 4 cents a pound, and in some instances cheese that is imported the tax actually amounts to 3½ cents per pound.

Tax on corn, under the 1930 Tariff Act, was 25 cents per bushel on imports. It has been reduced under present trade treaties.

The tax on hay under the 1930 Tariff Act was \$5 per ton for imports. Under the treaty of 1935 it was left at \$5, but when it was renewed in 1938 it was reduced 50 percent, or \$2.50 per ton.

Oats, under the Tariff Act of 1930, was taxed 16 cents a bushel on imports, and under the new agreement this has been reduced 50 percent, or 8 cents a bushel.

I give you these comparisons so that you may see the reason for the price of farm products going down in the United States. If our own farmers had been permitted to produce the farm products that have been imported into this country by foreign countries, then the prices would be much higher

than they are now; but when foreign countries, who pay about one-tenth or less for the cost of production of these products than we have to pay to produce them, then they can ship them in here under the present tariff and undersell any of these farm products that our farmers can produce.

I have refrained from criticizing anybody for present conditions, but I feel myself personally that the tariff on farm products should be high enough so that the American farmer may get the cost of production plus a reasonable profit before permitting the goods to be shipped in from foreign countries that have been produced by cheap labor. Anyone who has been privileged to visit these foreign countries and can compare the standard of living of those countries with our own will realize at once that we cannot possibly compete with them.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I trust a few fighting Democrats may come in. I shall regret exceedingly if they are not present.

Mr. Chairman, I felt that this was a good time to carry on a sort of conversational argument, as it would not be difficult to be heard. I desire to make a few observations. Inasmuch as the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures is in front of me, I will explain to you why I have not this year, being the ranking man on the Committee on Expenditures, demanded a series of investigations. I have earnestly asked for so many in the past few years, and with no results, that I am simply tired of making such demands. I am forced to take this particular forum to make my remonstrances. I had a letter the other day asking me how many times I had demanded these investigations. This was probably because the writer had not noticed them of late and I feel called upon to explain. I desire to claim with some satisfaction on my part that during the last 7 years I have made many speeches on the floor of this House, feeling compelled to do so as the ranking man on the Committee on Expenditures. If ever a man could say with the greatest satisfaction, "I told you so," I am he.

Some 5 years ago I took the floor for 40 minutes, explaining that we would have a \$7,000,000,000 Government permanently established. We have a \$9,000,000,000 Government permanently established. In all predictions, when I was called the Jeremiah of the Republican Party—predictions as I foresaw them—what I portrayed was far below the full extent of the actual results. I spoke long ago about the asinine silver policy. It is more asinine, and so proven, than even I dared portray. I have complained about the gold policy. Everyone now is aroused and fearful about it. We have accumulated vast sums more than I ever predicted. Why was I so modest in these predictions? None of us dreamed of the continuous extravagance and "foolishments" of the New Deal before it could run its course.

I spoke about the morale of the people of the Nation. Contemplate it! Badly it was needed. Extravagantly showered over the Nation, even to the wealthiest communities, for vote-getting purposes. Morale! I may have illustrated before: He was injured on the job. The foreman met the little daughter and said, "When will your father probably be back to work?" She replied, "I don't think for a long time. Compensation has set in."

We are accustomed and hardened to receiving relief today. We do not hesitate to take it. Our cheeks do not burn when we ask for it. Rather our cheeks burn in anger if hesitation is shown in granting it. We have been spending many billions of borrowed money. I predicted 6 years ago a debt of \$40,000,000,000. You might refer back to that time and note the ridicule following that prediction. Well, the debt is fifty billion now. It will be forty-five billion direct debt by next July and there are more than five billion more in notes that we have endorsed and guaranteed. It will be a direct debt of fifty billion before long. There is not the slightest chance of it being less.

The Democrats have built a house that even the Republicans cannot run decently without going into further debt. We cannot and do not tear down the house any administration has erected. We are forced to live in it. We can simply try to run it more efficiently. May I say to those Democrats who yesterday were so overjoyed at those large appropriations which they added "that he who sometimes grabs at the gravy falls into the soup."

It was rather sad for some of us here to watch the Democrats with such great glee raid the Treasury at the very moment when we are headed, as we certainly are, toward national bankruptcy. No nation ever did or can have constant deficits without inflation. That needs no argument. Everybody must know this danger. The Democratic Party must know it. But it is a habit of spending they have gotten into. We heard one of their great leaders on Wednesday, in a 5-minute speech, try to halt them. He stated that the economic stability of the Nation meant more to him than these appropriations. He pleaded most earnestly, but just as earnestly not very long ago he even threatened, as well as pleaded, that they vote for billions of dollars and the giving of blank checks that the President might shower the money unrestricted. So you see it is too late now for the leaders to check their former followers.

The country must have absolutely lost faith in the Democratic Party. We must change the occupant of the White House. Even the White House expenditures have increased its expenses 1,000 percent. If they listened to Mr. Dewey speaking over the radio last night the ears of Democrats must have burned red. He only gave facts—but so clearly and convincingly stated. I pause for a moment. No Democrat seems to want to interrupt me. I wonder why.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There are only three or four of them here. Oh, there are more than that number.

Mr. GIFFORD. I took this time for their benefit. Some of us are very anxious that we have some change in the occupancy of the White House. This third term distresses me. However, I realize what a terrible state the Democrats are in, because other candidates would like to declare themselves, but hardly dare. Their punishment might be most drastic. My Massachusetts Democrats say they are for Mr. Farley, but if Mr. Roosevelt runs they would be for him. However, I do not think we can endure this leadership any longer. She said to him: "You are getting to be unbearable. It will soon be impossible to live with you." He hopefully looked at her and said, "How soon?" That is the way I feel about it. A change cannot come too soon.

Now, I rejoice here today that the Democrats who are here agree with me. And they are true Democrats. They are apparently not of the type of these New Dealers who do not care if they do plunge the country into national bankruptcy. New Dealers complain about economic royalists; but every day they beg them to furnish the capital to run the Nation. When banks or other people lend us money to carry on they can assume at some time some control of our business. The banks are now furnishing nearly all the money, and they may soon control this Government. Last year the country banks outside of New York City did not increase their portfolios a dollar in United States bonds. The New York City banks accounted for the full increase.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman would not say that the bank control is evidenced in the interest rate, would he?

Mr. GIFFORD. No; but in the end they may have power to control. At the present time we have issued so many notes or bonds and have so much so-called debt money that no one knows what to do with it. I want to make this clear, I have tried before. You give a note for a thousand dollars payable in 20 to 40 years. That is grand for the Government. You have created \$1,000 in money that can circulate until the note or bond is paid. Every bond you issue, every bond that is

taken by the banks, creates an equal amount of money, and we have now so much money that the danger of inflation is known to all. There is nothing else to do with this money but to buy more debt and create still more money. As I tried to say the other day, the insurance companies are being urged to buy more Government bonds because they pay cash and no new money created. There is much more I would enjoy mentioning, but you on the Democratic side have agreed with me so perfectly that I will yield the floor. I have enjoyed these few minutes at a time when others were not desirous of taking it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN A. HALL].

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I am not able to talk about District of Columbia affairs even though it is the subject of the afternoon. However, I am very well versed in a problem which is particularly sectional in nature at the present time. I refer to the very serious hay shortage in my district, about which I spoke last week. I desire to emphasize that the problem which my farmers are facing is rapidly becoming a serious one.

At this time I wish to say that the farmers of my district are absolutely without hay and it is 2 months from now until pasture time when their herds may be able to get fresh fodder. I have gone into this problem very thoroughly with the Department of Agriculture and I point out that the measure which I recently introduced, H. R. 8312, better known as the Hall farm bill, is now pending for consideration. It has been my good fortune to obtain a promise from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture today that hearings will be held on this particular measure.

When it becomes my opportunity to be designated a date for that hearing, I am going to ask as a special favor not particularly to me but to the farmers of my district that as many Members from agricultural areas attend that hearing as can possibly find time to do so.

My bill, in short, provides for a policy to be created by the Secretary of Agriculture that when a particular section has been endangered or has been stricken by an act of nature such as droughts, floods, fire, and so forth, he may be authorized to take steps in that locality as regards the regulation of the price of hay. I may mention at this time that hay in my district has soared to the fabulous price of from \$18 to \$22 per ton, and that unscrupulous dealers have taken the opportunity afforded by this unfortunate situation to bring hay and fodder from outside and take advantage of the farmers of the farmers in my district by giving them short weight. Not only that, but hay has been brought in from other areas and sold to the farmers who could not possibly buy it at these prices.

I found that the Department of Agriculture was having trouble in making loans available for hay at \$20 a ton. You will agree with me that no farmer who is facing economic bankruptcy today will be able to borrow money to purchase hay at that fabulous price when he is unable even to buy food for himself. Therefore, the presentation of this measure, while it may affect only my district today, may next year or the next year or the next year affect the districts which you represent. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

REPENTANCE SHOULD FOLLOW CONFESSION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, an editorial in this morning's issue of the Washington Post, a great newspaper, published in the Capital of the richest and most powerful nation in the world, contains unintentionally, no doubt, the most devastating indictment of the New Deal, of the President of the United States, and of the present Congress that has ever been made of a governmental agency since our Nation came into existence.

This editorial is captioned "Erosion of Character." Let me quote from the editorial—

In his St. Louis address Thomas E. Dewey accused the administration of "a fundamental lack of integrity, a cynical disregard of the principles of common honesty." These are harsh charges.

But they have been made before. Listen to this statement made by the venerable Democratic Senator from Virginia [CARTER GLASS], who unwaveringly, unafraid, has served the great State of Virginia in the United States Senate for so long; who has eyes to see, a mind to analyze, and the courage to state the fact. Long before Mr. Dewey began his campaign the Senator said:

The New Deal, taken all in all, is not only a mistake, it is a disgrace to the Nation, and the time is not far distant when we shall be ashamed of having wandered so far from the dictates of common sense and common honesty.

Here we have the young crusading racketbuster from the city of New York and the gray-haired patriotic sage of the Senate characterizing the present administration as lacking truthfulness and honesty, without which no nation can prosper and continue to exist.

This editorial then continues—

But Mr. Dewey did not stop at generalizations. He went ahead to cite instance after instance of broken pledges, renewed promises, and fresh breaches of faith.

Thus he noted the President's repudiation of the gold standard soon after his election upon a platform advocating a "sound currency," and his repeated promises to balance the Budget, ending with conversion to a spending theory which associates budget-balancing with disaster.

Mr. Dewey also passed in review the administration's attempt to "undermine the Constitution"—notably the proposal to pack the Supreme Court, and subsequent unsuccessful efforts to effect a "political purge" of the lawmakers who had opposed the Court-packing plan.

It is not an adequate answer to say that platform promises are made only to be broken. And there is a certain speciousness about the familiar argument that unforeseen emergencies justify lightninglike changes of policy. Mr. Dewey's target is obviously the President himself. And the latter's record is unquestionably vulnerable, because of the multiplicity of broken pledges that could have been kept without danger to the national welfare.

From the foregoing quotation you will note that the editorial does not question the soundness of Dewey's indictment, its truthfulness, nor does it charge that Dewey's recital of the facts did not carry conviction of that charge. The editorial rather seeks by confession an avoidance to excuse the lack of truthfulness and the lack of common honesty shown by the President's administration of his office up to this time. This attempted palliation of the lack of moral fiber in the present administration is given in these words—again I quote from the Post:

Despite the vigor of the St. Louis speech it is questionable whether a recital of this sort will arouse any great amount of indignation. The fact is that the "erosion of character" of which Mr. Dewey complains in the National Government is paralleled in private life. Indeed, it is probable that the vacillation which characterizes our governmental policies is a reflection of the groping of bewildered individuals for a solution of the numerous social and economic problems that now affect their daily lives.

Here is an indictment not of the administration but of the American people as a whole and of this Congress in particular. Note again this sentence, from the editorial:

Despite the vigor of the St. Louis speech it is questionable whether a recital of this sort will arouse any great amount of indignation.

What is the implication from that statement? It is this: That notwithstanding candidate Roosevelt's statement that—

We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power, and that the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of a contract to which they are asked to subscribe.

he has seen fit, because of political expediency, to so often violate his solemn promises to the American people that they have become accustomed to the thought that truthfulness is no longer expected from the Chief Executive of the Nation.

What a long, long way we have traveled from the days of George Washington when truth was held to be a cardinal

virtue and the lowliest citizen of the Republic who failed to keep his promise was without credit or respect in his community.

If the thought expressed in this editorial be true, and there is some truth in it, the lessons to children at the mother's knee must be redoubled and emphasized. The old, old saying that honesty is the best policy must again, day after day, be brought home to our citizens so that undone may be the harm and the false doctrine which has been implanted in the minds of the people by our Chief Executive and those who surround him.

Mr. Dewey charged that there had been an "erosion of character" of this administration, if one may speak of an administration as having character. The Washington Post charges that the "erosion of character" of which Mr. Dewey complains in the National Government is paralleled in private life.

The Post charges that the "vacillation which characterizes our governmental policies is a reflection of the groping of bewildered individuals for a solution of the numerous social and economic problems that now affect their daily lives."

Rather the truth is that the people have come to have less regard for truth and honesty because of the lack of those qualities in the present administration. It is not the lack of truth and honesty in the common people which has seduced and corrupted this administration; it is the lack of those qualities in the administration which has undermined, and to a certain extent, dulled those virtues in the minds of the people.

The man who leads the way in times of great national stress, a Washington, a Lincoln, not only reflects the thought of the people, but serves ever as a real leader of the people by his acts, his conduct, and faithfulness to his public utterances, setting an example which all might follow with safety.

If there is among the people of this Nation lack of respect for truth, for honesty, it is because of the example which the Chief Executive has given them during the past 7 years.

The problems which confront this Nation today are no different in principle than those which have always confronted us as a Nation. No man worthy of leading us can excuse the failure to be truthful and honest by the whimpering cry of expediency. The responsibility for our present condition, for the carelessness with which we as a people regard the breaking of promises, the waste, extravagance, the borrowings which enable us to shift our burdens to the shoulders of future generations, rests not alone upon the shoulders of the President and his advisors but squarely upon us, the Members of Congress, who day after day fail to keep our promises to safeguard our Nation from national bankruptcy; from the destruction by governmental agencies of the liberty which our forefathers so dearly won.

Have we forgotten the old proverb—

As a dog returneth to his vomit, so a fool returneth to his folly.

How much longer will we violate our promises, and as a Nation continue to borrow and spend, submit to bureaucrats, Government underlings, stealing from our people the right to free speech, a free press, due process of law, a fair trial in our courts?

Read again and ponder well this editorial from the Washington Post and then, standing convicted as we do of undermining at least some of the necessary foundations of our Government—that is, creating a disregard for truth and honesty—let us repent and before the session ends, give a demonstration by our acts, that our repentance is not a sham and a deception. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired; all time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For general supplies, repairs, new batteries and battery supplies, telephone rental and purchase, telephone service charges, wire and cable for extension of telegraph and telephone service, repairs of lines and instruments, purchase of poles, tools, insulators, brackets, pins, hardware, cross arms, ice, record book, stationery, extra labor, new boxes, maintenance of motortrucks, and other necessary items, \$34,700.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee.

I notice in the bill that money is available for the construction of a new armory, based upon an authorization carried in the appropriation bill of last year. I want to know whether or not this entire amount is coming out of District funds or whether any of it comes out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. CALDWELL. It all comes out of the District with the exception of that portion which is allocable to the Federal Government under the Federal contribution of \$6,000,000.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida. I have a large number of protests against the appropriation of money by the Congress out of the Treasury of the United States for the construction of a convention hall or an auditorium, in the District of Columbia. The taxpayers back home feel that their money or Government money should not be used for such a purpose, and if the people of the District of Columbia desire to construct an auditorium or a convention hall, or whatever you might call it, for convention purposes, and so forth, they should pay for it themselves.

I notice in the report you have several legislative provisions wherein you authorize the Commissioners to enter into contract or contracts for additions to schools, and so forth. Is there any such provision in this bill that would take care of an auditorium, convention hall, or arena?

Mr. CALDWELL. There is a provision in this bill for the continuation of the construction of an armory.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am talking about an auditorium, convention hall, or arena.

Mr. CALDWELL. No; there is not. The armory is the only thing to which you might refer and the only contribution the taxpayers of your State may make is, perhaps, the contribution toward one-eighth of the total cost of the armory.

Mr. COCHRAN. That money for the armory comes out of the general funds of the District of Columbia and can be properly spent for that purpose, but what I want to make sure of is that there is no money coming out of the United States Treasury alone for the purpose of constructing an auditorium, convention hall, or an arena out of Federal funds alone.

Mr. CALDWELL. The gentleman may be assured that such is the fact.

Mr. COCHRAN. Washington is called the ideal convention city. We have often read in the local press that political national conventions, outstanding athletic events such as the Army-Navy football game, and so forth, could be brought here if proper facilities were available. That is the business of the people of Washington but it is properly the business of my constituents and taxpayers to protest the use of their money to make provisions to care for such events, thus taking that business from them.

My home city, St. Louis, is a great convention city. The finest of hotel accommodations and proper buildings to hold conventions are available. The city is in the center of the country. The money to provide proper facilities for conventions came out of the pockets of the people of St. Louis and therefore I submit it would be unfair to use their money to construct suitable buildings and fields in Washington which in the end would certainly at least compete with my city. I hope the committee will always bear this in mind and if ever an attempt is made to authorize such places provisions will be made that the money to do the work come out of the revenue of the District of Columbia and not out of the Treasury.

The clerk read as follows:

For contingent and other necessary expenses, including equipment and purchase of all necessary articles and supplies for classes in industrial, commercial, and trade instruction, \$4,000.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, everybody who seems to have anything to say, any place in the Nation, nowadays, refers to it as America's No. 1 problem, but if this Congress wants to take cognizance of the real No. 1 problem of this country they have it right here in the District of Columbia, and in the hearings at page 179.

In these hearings you will find that in the elementary-school system of the District, among the white children in 1930, there was an enrollment of 33,631 children, and in 1939 there was an enrollment of 29,951 children; at the same time there was an increase in the population of the District of Columbia from 463,000 to the estimated present population of 685,000.

Enrollment in elementary schools—membership reports of Nov. 1, 1930, 1933, 1934, 1935, Oct. 30, 1936, Oct. 29, 1937, Oct. 28, 1938, and Oct. 27, 1939

School	1930	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939
Divisions 1-9 (white):								
Kindergarten, grade 8.....	32,779	31,592	32,781	32,468	31,564	30,592	29,638	28,588
Ungraded.....	852	1,064	1,117	1,053	1,076	1,157	1,136	1,363
Total, divisions 1-9.....	33,631	32,656	33,898	33,521	32,640	31,749	30,774	29,951
Divisions 10-13 (colored):								
Kindergarten, grade 8.....	18,901	19,780	20,808	21,414	21,634	21,521	22,109	21,787
Ungraded.....	327	648	678	606	592	705	371	908
Total, divisions 10-13.....	19,228	20,428	21,486	22,020	22,226	22,226	22,480	22,695
Total elementary:								
Graded.....	51,680	51,372	53,589	53,882	53,198	52,113	51,747	50,375
Ungraded.....	1,179	1,712	1,795	1,659	1,668	1,862	1,507	1,271
Total, divisions 1-13.....	52,859	53,084	55,384	55,541	54,866	53,975	53,254	51,646
Increase or decrease over preceding year.....	1,413	349	2,300	157	-675	-891	-721	-608

¹ Includes 495 pupils belonging to the Bundy School which makes a special feature of industrial arts but is not considered a special school for occupational classes.

There is your No. 1 problem, the fall-off in the child birth rate of America. It has declined from 25.1 in 1915 to 17.6 in 1938 per 1,000 population.

Statement indicating the birth rate (number of live births per 1,000 population) for the United States, 1915-37

Year:	
1915.....	25.1
1916.....	25.0
1917.....	24.7
1918.....	24.6
1919.....	23.3
1920.....	23.7
1921.....	24.2
1922.....	22.3
1923.....	22.2
1924.....	22.4
1925.....	21.5
1926.....	20.7
1927.....	20.6
1928.....	19.8
1929.....	18.9
1930.....	18.9
1931.....	18.0
1932.....	17.4
1933.....	16.5
1934.....	17.1
1935.....	16.9
1936.....	16.7
1937.....	17.0
1938 ¹	17.6

¹ 1938 figures are provisional.

This reduction is Nation-wide, and as Frank C. Waldrop rightfully said in his column in the Washington Times-Herald yesterday, you will not be troubled very much longer with building elementary schools in this Nation except to replace those that become obsolete. You will not need as many doctors interested in children as are required today, less teachers, less nursemaids, less clothing, less agricultural products, and all down the line. It is your No. 1 problem, and do not have any doubt about it. The absent child of today is the missing but necessary adult of tomorrow.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEAL. Consistency is such a rare jewel in these days and times, and so few people speak who are qualified as experts, I would like to add at this point that the gentle-

man who is speaking on this subject, certainly is qualified, having nine children of his own. [Applause.]

Mr. RABAUT. I thank the gentleman, and I am proud of it.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I am very pleased to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I think we should clarify the gentleman's statement a little bit as to the increase or decrease of pupils in the elementary schools in Washington. The testimony before our committee shows that the population of Washington is around 613,000, and the percentage of colored people in the District of Columbia is 27 percent, yet the elementary school population in the public schools is 43 percent.

Mr. RABAUT. Colored children.

Mr. STEFAN. The colored population in the city is 27 percent and the colored population in the elementary schools is 43 percent.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to say further to the Committee that after the above and surprising facts had been given to your subcommittee we were approached concerning the nuisance of the dog population of Washington.

As long as I can remember the subject of the poet's pen and the artist's brush has been a boy and his dog. I imagine if we could go back far enough we would find that the original dogs were domesticated to be the companions and protectors of children. Today, with the marked reduction in child population, we hear a great complaint about the excess number of dogs in the city of Washington, and while I am the master of a devoted Irish setter, the faithful companion of my children, nevertheless, I want to know who are petting all these dogs?

The Clerk read as follows:

For the maintenance of schools for crippled pupils, \$3,500.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I take this time in order to get into the RECORD the following letter from Mr. William E. Hayes, chairman, taxation committee, District of Columbia Bar Association, in reply to a recommendation carried in the report accompanying this bill, which I shall read:

The House Appropriations Committee, under date of Wednesday, March 27, 1940, reported the District of Columbia's 1941 appropriation bill to the House and in the report the Committee said, among other things:

"In recommending \$14,040 for the Board of Tax Appeals, which is the amount of the current appropriation, the committee wishes to call attention to the fact that the Board is composed of a single member without any considerable training and experience in matters of property valuation, who is called upon to review and adjust assessments fixed by the Board of Assessors, which has the experience, background, and information to do a better job than anyone else.

"The Committee finds difficulty in reconciling a condition of this kind, and recommends that consideration be given to improvement of the situation by the appropriate authorities."

The purpose of the Board of Tax Appeals of the District of Columbia, as now constituted, is to afford taxpayers of the District of Columbia an independent review by an independent tribunal of every type of tax paid by the taxpayers of the District of Columbia, whether it be real estate, inheritance, estate, personal property, income, or others. The determination of the proper tax, regardless of the type of tax, naturally involves an independent review of the law, and the facts pertaining to the particular issue, including in many instances the valuation of property. The Board is quasi-judicial and determines the facts, including valuation, in certain cases, upon the evidence presented at the hearing. It is not contemplated that he should possess the qualifications of an assessor or an appraiser any more than a judge or a jury who is called upon to perform a similar type function in the ordinary lawsuit.

To leave valuation questions with the Board of Assessors, one of whom makes the assessment originally, is to deprive the taxpayers of the independent review to which they are now entitled and which can only be had by an independent tribunal, such as the present Board of Tax Appeals of the District of Columbia.

In response to a suggestion some time ago that the Board of Tax Appeals be abolished, 23 civic organizations, including the Bar Association of the District of Columbia, the Association of Certified Public Accountants, and the Board of Trade, and similar organizations, appeared and strongly protested the abolition of the Board of Tax Appeals.

It is felt that the statement herein referred to is a misconception of the purposes of the Board and its functions, and equally so to have the review of valuation questions of real estate revert to the

Board of Assessors of the District would be a grave injustice to the taxpayers of the District and deprive them of the right they unanimously asserted they desired when they appeared and demanded an independent Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia.

WM. E. HAYES,

Chairman Taxation Committee, District of Columbia Bar Association.

Mr. Chairman, I point out to Members at this time that the Board of Tax Appeals was created about 2 years ago by the Committee on the District of Columbia. That was done at the instance of repeated requests and demands by the taxpayers of the District that such a Board be set up, because under the old law we had this situation. A man went out and assessed your property, and he fixed the valuation on the property and levied the assessment. Then you appealed from that, and then found that man with other men out of the assessor's office sitting as the board of appeals. It is the opinion of the District of Columbia Committee that there should be some appeal to an independent authority rather than an appeal to the man who fixed the valuation and who had levied the assessment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase and repair of furniture, tools, machinery, material, and books, and apparatus to be used in connection with instruction in manual and vocational training, and incidental expenses connected therewith, including all necessary expenses in connection with the operation, maintenance, and repair of automobiles used in driver-training courses, \$70,400, to be immediately available.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CALDWELL: Page 26, line 12, strike out the words "including all" and insert "and for insurance and all other"; and in line 14, after the words "repair of", insert "District-owned or loaned."

Mr. CALDWELL. That is a clarifying amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For textbooks and other educational books and supplies as authorized by the act of January 31, 1930 (46 Stat. 62), including not to exceed \$7,000 for personal services, \$190,000, to be immediately available.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOREN: Page 27, line 21, strike out all of lines 21 to 24, inclusive.

Mr. BOREN rose.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to make a speech on this subject. The Federal Government does not provide free textbooks for any other students in any other part of the Nation, and I do not believe the Federal Government should provide free textbooks for students in the District of Columbia. At the present time they are providing free textbooks even in the high schools of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman realizes that the District pays over \$40,000,000 in taxes, and that this money comes from the taxpayers of the District of Columbia and is not provided for out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BOREN. Just the same, the Federal Government contributes \$6,000,000 to the District and pays a portion of this free-textbook cost.

Mr. MAHON. The chairman of the subcommittee advises me that it is required by law to make this appropriation.

Mr. BOREN. I recognize that this item is required by law, but the funds come out of public funds, nevertheless, appropriated by Congress, and I do not feel it is justified.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. There is a total of \$48,000,000, and only \$6,000,000 is contributed by the Federal Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOREN) there were ayes 1 and noes 18.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of the appropriations herein made for the public schools of the District of Columbia shall be used for the free instruction of pupils who dwell outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to pupils who are enrolled in the schools of the District of Columbia on the date of the approval of this act.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SASSCER: On page 31 strike out all of lines 15 to 20, inclusive.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to strike lines 15 to 20, inclusive, on page 31, from the act. The purpose of those lines is to repeal existing law which permits children whose parents work either in the Government service or in private employment in the District of Columbia, but who live without the District, to be admitted free into the District of Columbia schools. Although, to some extent, this is legislation on an appropriation measure, I did not make a point of order against it, possibly because it is by way of limitation, a point of order might not be well taken.

Briefly, I understand there are some 2,500 children who come into the District schools; that the cost of education of those children is something over \$250,000. It may be asked why should those children come in free. I might briefly say that the parents of those children live on the border of the District of Columbia and, speaking for Maryland, I can say that as far as reciprocity is concerned, children of the District of Columbia go free to the Maryland schools. In my own county, just on the border of the District of Columbia, I am informed there are some hundred children who reside in the District of Columbia, in the outlying sections, who attend Maryland schools free. I am sure the same situation is true in Montgomery County, where a great many District of Columbia children go free to the Montgomery County schools.

In addition to that, our great university at College Park, built up now to the point where it stands foremost among those of the Nation, is supported by the taxpayers of Maryland. We permit students from the District of Columbia to attend that university at practically the same cost to Maryland students, and less than the charge made to the students from other States.

I have been in touch with our Maryland government for some years. One of the reasons why that reciprocity was extended was because the children in Maryland, whose parents work in the District of Columbia, go free to the District of Columbia schools. There are seven or eight hundred District of Columbia students who go to College Park at \$75 per year less than students from other States, making a total in that one item alone of over \$50,000. I feel sure that in addition to the spirit of reciprocity and cooperation prevailing in greater Washington, if we check this down the

line and take into consideration the children from the District of Columbia who attend Maryland schools free, and take into consideration the great number who attend the University of Maryland, there cannot be any question about the fairness and justice of this amendment. The parents of these children are not Marylanders necessarily. In that suburban section many citizens of different States reside and retain their residence at home. They work in the Government in the District of Columbia and some bring their children into the District of Columbia. The fact that the Federal Government does appropriate a substantial sum for the District of Columbia should be taken into consideration, also. If you would go out to the District line and see how the Maryland people on their way home are trading at the District stores, you can realize how much Maryland money is spent here. Practically all of their money for clothing, and so forth, is spent in the department stores in the District of Columbia. So you can see it is not only eminently fair because of the money we spend here but Maryland has met its reciprocity by accepting District children into its university and into its own public schools.

I therefore respectfully ask that this reciprocity be not destroyed, and this act repealed by this appropriation bill. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, on the question of reciprocity I am not sure what the situation is in Maryland, but in the hearings Dr. Ballou was asked about this problem.

As will be found on page 191 of the hearings, he said:

I got a letter just the other day, following a newspaper discussion of this matter, calling attention to the fact that a resident of the District was sending a child to a school in one of the counties of Virginia, and that resident of the District has to pay tuition in that county in Virginia.

District students are not given the same privileges at the University of Maryland that Maryland students are given. Twenty-eight hundred students from Virginia and Maryland are now going to school in the District. It is unfair to burden the people of the District with this additional \$265,000. The people who are sending their children to the District are in the upper financial brackets and there is no reason why they could not pay a modest or reasonable sum for that privilege. I think they should.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Do the political subdivisions that are adjacent to the District of Columbia have any law whereby they might repay the District the amount of the tuition that might be charged for these children attending District schools?

Mr. CALDWELL. I am not certain as to that.

Mr. DONDERO. We have such a law in my State of Michigan. I am quite familiar with it.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is provision made whereby parents, if they want to send their children to the District schools, may do so upon payment of tuition and mileage?

Mr. CALDWELL. Oh, yes. The school department is authorized, under the language of this limitation, to accept such students upon payment of reasonable tuition—whatever may be fixed. I may say further that this does not apply to children now enrolled but to future enrollees.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Is there any provision whereby Members of Congress have to pay for the education of their children in the District?

Mr. CALDWELL. I am not sure about that.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Is it not true that their children are educated without any charge at all?

Mr. CALDWELL. I believe that is true.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Why should not they pay?

Mr. CALDWELL. Their children should be treated the same as the children of any other residents of the District;

they are educated in the District schools whether the parents reside here temporarily or permanently.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. In the past the House has passed this item and it has been fought on the other side of the Capitol. Considerable opposition has always come from Representatives from neighboring States. I do not feel that the taxpayers in my State of Nebraska, who are ready to pay a portion of the Government's \$6,000,000 contribution to the general expenses of running the District, should be taxed for the tuition of pupils from Maryland and Virginia who participate in these benefits here.

The schools of the District of Columbia are perhaps the finest schools in the United States; they are model schools. People come from all over the country endeavoring to send their children to the District schools. I do not blame the people in Maryland and Virginia for endeavoring to secure this fine free tuition, but I do not want my taxpayers in Nebraska to contribute to the education of the children of Maryland and Virginia, who must pay tuition should they send their children to other States.

Dr. Ballou, Superintendent of Schools in the District of Columbia, states that there is absolutely no reciprocity so far as tuition is concerned between Maryland and Virginia. I do not blame my colleagues from Virginia and Maryland for trying to retain this advantage for their people. They are always fighting against the dropping of this privilege, which costs from \$250,000 to \$265,000, which should be their own responsibility.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. I yield.

Mr. SASSCER. So far as reciprocity is concerned in the case of Maryland University, does the gentleman realize that there is no land-grant school in the District of Columbia, and that for their vocational training District students go to the University of Maryland absolutely free and the others go there on a reduced basis?

Mr. CALDWELL. All I know is what the superintendent of schools told us at the hearings.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SASSCER) there were—ayes 8, noes 29.

So the motion to the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the pay and allowances of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, in accordance with the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia" (43 Stat. 174-175), as amended by the act of July 1, 1930 (46 Stat. 839-841), including one captain, who shall be property clerk, and the present acting sergeant in charge of police automobiles, who shall have the rank and pay of a sergeant, \$2,924,280.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHULTE: Page 35, line 20, strike out "\$2,924,280" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,948,505"; and on page 68, line 7, strike out "\$516,050" and insert in lieu thereof "\$520,325."

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced this amendment for the purpose of increasing the Police Department of the District of Columbia by 25 men. Of course it means an increase in the Budget of \$42,500. The men are started off at a salary of \$1,900 a year, which is the salary paid to rookies. Now, let me state the reason for this amendment.

We have been reading in the newspapers constantly of hold-ups, burglaries, the snatching of purses, and other petty

crimes. I do not mind saying to you that Washington is fast becoming known as the petty-crime center of the universe. Do you know that just this morning on the Capitol Grounds there was a hold-up? On the Capitol Ground of the Nation! Certainly this is becoming serious when they are so brazen as to attempt a hold-up on the Capitol Grounds. When the matter of robberies is called to the attention of the major of police he continues to say that he is short of police, he has not enough men.

Let me say to the Members of the House that the major has some justification for saying that very thing, and I believe we all agree that he does not have enough men, so certainly he is right in advancing that sort of an argument because of the fact that they are constantly draining his department. Men are taken to the White House to accompany the President to the train and to receive the President when he comes back and they perform other functions such as guarding the embassies, the legations, and a great many other duties they do not have to perform in other cities, but must do here in the District of Columbia. Last year there were 4,000 man-hours used in that type and kind of service.

I appreciate the fact that the Police Department in the District here is entitled to be streamlined and that there are some ills and faults with the Police Department that should be corrected. For instance, 14 men from the Police Department, drawing a salary of \$2,400 a year each, are assigned as hack inspectors. They are the fellows who go out and ask the hack driver if he has a license. They see if he has four wheels on his taxicab and perform services of that kind. Those are not the duties of a policeman, and this service, I maintain, should be placed in the Traffic Department under the supervision of Mr. Van Duzer, and certainly a big saving could be effected right here in this department. Instead of paying policemen \$2,400 a year, others could do it for \$1,800 a year, so that would give us about 14 more men to do police work. Those are some of the things we have to contend with—and again here is another incident. There are 10 or 12 men from the Police Department assigned to the A. B. C. Board. Those men are charged against the Police Department. They go around to see that the taverns have licenses, they see that there are no violations going on in these taverns, and again I say that does not belong to the Police Department. This work again should be done by men hired by the A. B. C. Board, and should they have any trouble they could call on the man on the beat. The man on the beat should be able to take care of that situation.

If we could get the Commissioners to cooperate with the people of the District of Columbia and cooperate with the various heads of departments, we would not have any argument in the District of Columbia for the vote and suffrage. But we do not have that now. I hope when the President makes his next appointment to the District Commission that he will select someone who has no connection whatsoever with the District Building or any of its affiliates, someone who really has the District of Columbia and its people at heart. I am frank to say, if he does appoint a man of that type, we can correct this situation very quickly, and I am serious when I make that statement. I have been a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia for the past 8 years, and I feel that I have gained quite a bit of experience by being a member of that committee and that I can speak authoritatively.

Mr. Chairman, in going over the Police Department and its various subdivisions I can readily understand why the major should have an additional 25 men. He has been working the men from 8 o'clock in the morning until 12 at night. He has to do that because of the fact that the crime wave is here. At least that is what the newspapers have called it, and certainly it has been very serious in the last 2 weeks. It subsides one night, then breaks out again the next night. Your constituents and mine have probably had the same experience that I had the misfortune to go through. I do not want to face these guns. It is not a pleasant thing to look into the business end of a gun and be told to surrender your money. I am frank to state that around 1,400 or 1,425 police are not sufficient in a city of 629,000 people, when they are

assigned to other bureaus, while still being charged to the Police Department. I hope that at some time or other with District Commissioners whose sole interests are in the District of Columbia and its welfare this thing may be ironed out to the satisfaction of everyone concerned, and I want to suggest to the Commissioners now to have the police who are assigned to the hack inspectors and the A. B. C. Board that they be returned back to the Police Department for which they were hired, and then hire men who are paid but \$1,800 a year to do this clerical work that is to be done in these agencies.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment will be agreed to, which will provide \$42,500 for an additional 25 policemen to be used for the prevention of crime and hold-ups in the District of Columbia.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, the number of police does not always mean efficiency with reference to a police department. There are 133 Capitol police up here on the Hill; and if there was a hold-up on Capitol Hill this morning, it was not due to a lack of police. Certainly if the same proportion of police were employed all over the city of Washington, it would be quite impossible to pay all of them. That is not where the difficulty lies. The remedy is in having the Police Department do the job as it should be done on the Hill and in Washington.

Taking 12 comparable cities in the United States, Washington has more policemen in proportion to population than 9 of those cities. There are only 3 of them that have more.

Your committee has gone into this very carefully. The amount in the amendment would exceed the Budget estimate. Also, Washington, in addition to having more policemen than most cities of the United States in proportion to population, has for its protection 72 Park Police, 133 Capitol Police, and 60 members of the Secret Service. Every building in Washington has its custodial guard and, as you know, hundreds and hundreds of men are used in that capacity, and they are, in a certain sense, policemen. The committee allowed the Budget estimate. As I stated, our committee has gone into this very carefully, and as far as numbers are concerned Washington is better off than most cities. We see no reason to increase it, and we hope you will support the action of the committee.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I know the gentleman and the members of the Subcommittee on District Appropriations have considered this item carefully, as they have all other items. I am wondering if they realized in estimating the population of the District of Columbia that there are hundreds of thousands of persons who are here every day who are not counted in the regular population?

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes. I think the purpose of the guards and the custodians in the Government buildings, which these people frequent, is one reason we have so many guards, and they are there for the protection of the visiting public.

Mr. SCHULTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SCHULTE. I appreciate the fact we have 100 or more police around the Capitol, and that there are hundreds employed in the various Government buildings, but may I say to the gentleman that those guards are not allowed out of the buildings. They do not patrol the streets, the highways, or the byways, and that is where most of our petty crime is being committed today. One of the Members said to me, "Frankly, I am afraid to go out on the streets at night, and I am even afraid to drive my car."

Mr. O'NEAL. We have given the Police Department an increase every year, practically. It was increased by 25 last year. There are 1,400 police in Washington, which is 2.2 to every 1,000 of population.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CALDWELL. May I remind the gentleman that in the hearings, it developed that 14 members of the uniformed force are now being used throughout the city to inspect various buildings, and determine whether or not occupational licenses should be paid.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is true.

Mr. CALDWELL. They have taken 14 members of the police force out of circulation, and put them on another job.

Mr. SCHULTE. I grant that.

Mr. O'NEAL. The problem is to use what they have to better advantage. The committee went into this very carefully. I trust the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Of course, I am going to support the committee, as I am expected to do, but I do want to say that the kind and, I may say, the adequacy of the police force on Capitol Hill has been, at times, a source of no little distress to me. I am pleased that these boys have these jobs, as I know that nearly all of them go to school. However, we all know that when war comes in any country in the world a great many people lose their reason. I have thought for a long time that especially in times like these, in view of the importance of this building and its occupants, the Capitol Police ought to be supplemented in some fashion by men selected in the same way, and required to have the same physical and mental qualifications as the police in the average metropolitan center. I should like to know what the gentleman thinks of this idea.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman is referring to the Capitol Police?

Mr. RAYBURN. I am.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman is asking my personal opinion?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes. I know the gentleman has gone into matters like this, and I have not.

Mr. O'NEAL. With 133 police on Capitol Hill, as Members of Congress we certainly should give more attention to their selection, training, and discipline; because my observation has been that it is anything but a trained, soldierly, efficient outfit.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHULTE) there were—ayes 6, noes 31.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For personal services, \$143,145, including not to exceed \$1,265 for the salary of one part-time physician to be paid at the rate of \$3,800 per annum.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been impressed and oppressed by the fact that notwithstanding we like to believe that we are 435 representatives of the intelligence, the virtue, and the wisdom of the country, we neglect to do some things with respect to our membership and with regard to our friends on this floor which in any other body of this size would be deprecated by any of us. We come here in the morning and see that the flag is at half-staff, a signal that one has gone whom we have "loved long since and lost a while." Someone has died.

We go along about our business here and pass a resolution at the end of the day's work, and then adjourn out of respect to that Member, for whom we have respect and regard but for whom we show neither respect nor regard, by our insistence upon attending to trivial or important material matters and things incident to the day's work, utterly and hypocritically disregarding him, his death, and our loss. This should give us pause.

There is something more than the consideration of dollars and cents in living this life, else Socrates was right when he said: "The happiest man is he who is born dead."

I rise at this moment, sentimentally, you may say—but if life is worth living, it is because of the sentiment that is found

in it—to suggest to you that today in charge of this bill is one of the most able, efficient, and conscientious men who ever sat on this floor since I have known anything about it [applause], and my history goes back to the days when I was secretary to my father in 1909. I am speaking about a man who has had the courage to stand and to bear a terrific personal burden, but who has never imposed it upon any of us; a man who comes in here today after having announced publicly that he would never again seek to be a candidate for the office of Congressman but who privately, and I do not know but that he may have done so publicly, has stated that in taking the position as chairman, as he has, of this subcommittee he would undertake to leave to his successor a slate as clean as he could wipe it. I refer to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CALDWELL]. By his determination not again to be a candidate for Congress we have sustained a loss immeasurable.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For completely furnishing and equipping the Southwest health center, \$20,000, to be immediately available.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee about an item in connection with the Southwest health center. I do not speak now in any critical vein, but I believe that perhaps a little fuller explanation might be given than that which is carried in the report. I notice you have eliminated the proposal of the Budget for \$13,000, which was recommended to be used for the purchase of a site for the health center in Southwest Washington. I quote from the report, as follows:

The committee recommend \$20,000 for furnishing and equipping the new Southwest health center instead of \$21,000 as proposed by the Budget, and has eliminated the Budget proposal for \$13,000 to be used to purchase a site for a health center in Southwest Washington. The committee are of the opinion that this proposal should be deferred until the school-replacement program is undertaken, at which time one or more sites ideally located for this purpose will be available without additional cost to the District.

May I ask the gentleman when he believes the school-replacement program will make available a site which can be used for this purpose?

Mr. CALDWELL. As the gentleman knows, we are not able to make any definite prediction, but it was the feeling of the committee, and of all those with whom we talked, that within the next 1, 2, or 3 years there would be a sufficient consolidation and replacement of the old schools to provide a site that would be entirely suitable for this purpose.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I wish to see these health centers established as quickly as possible where they are needed in Washington. With this explanation of the chairman, I feel that I have no opposition to the deletion of this item.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the maintenance, under the jurisdiction of the Board of Public Welfare (of a suitable place in a building entirely separate and apart from the house of detention for the reception and detention of children under 18 years of age arrested by the police on charge of offense against any laws in force in the District of Columbia, or committed to the guardianship of the Board, or held as witness, or held temporarily, or pending hearing, or otherwise, including transportation, food, clothing, medicine, and medicinal supplies, rental, repair and upkeep of buildings, fuel, gas, electricity, ice, supplies, and equipment, and other necessary expenses, including not to exceed \$20,920 for personal services, \$39,000.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALDWELL: On page 47, line 11, strike out the parenthesis and insert a comma.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For current work of repairs to streets, avenues, roads, and alleys, including the reconditioning of existing gravel streets and roads; for cleaning snow and ice from streets, sidewalks, cross walks, and gutters in the discretion of the Commissioners; and including the purchase, exchange, maintenance, and operation of non-passenger-carrying motor vehicles used in this work, \$922,500, of which amount \$97,500 shall be available exclusively for snow-removal

purposes, \$18,000 thereof to be immediately available for reimbursement to the appropriation from which expenditures for such purposes have heretofore been made, and not to exceed \$37,500 thereof to be available for the procurement of snow-removal equipment: *Provided*, That appropriations contained in this act for highways, sewers, city refuse, and the Water Department shall be available for snow removal when specifically and in writing ordered by the Commissioners: *Provided further*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, should they deem such action to be to the advantage of the District of Columbia, are hereby authorized to purchase a municipal asphalt plant at a cost not to exceed \$30,000: *Provided further*, That not exceeding \$15,000 of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the preparation of plans, working drawings, and specifications for the construction of an underpass in the line of Sixteenth Street NW., at Scott Circle, including necessary changes in surface and underground structures within public property areas now occupied by roadways, sidewalks, walkways, parking and park reservations: *Provided further*, That upon the completion and approval of such plans by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the said Commissioners are authorized to submit the project as a Federal-aid highway project to the Public Roads Administration under the provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 633), and upon approval of such project by the Public Roads Administration the Commissioners are authorized to construct such underpass and perform such necessary incidental work and pay the cost thereof from the appropriation contained in this act for Federal-aid highway projects and the District's allocation of funds by the Public Roads Administration authorized by the said Federal Aid Highway Act: *Provided further*, That the necessary transfer of jurisdiction of public land and the relocation of monuments is authorized and directed under the provisions of the Land Transfer Act of May 20, 1932 (47 Stat. 161): *And provided further*, That the Commissioners are authorized to employ necessary engineering and other professional services, by contract or otherwise, without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and civil-service requirements.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against all of the paragraph beginning at line 23, page 72, the last three lines, and all of page 73, and lines 1 and 2, on page 74. I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, the committee is disposed very promptly to concede that the point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 9. No part of this appropriation shall be available for any expense by or incident to the issuance of congressional tags except to those persons set out in the act of December 19, 1932 (47 Stat. 750), including the Speaker and the Vice President.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 83, after line 5, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 10. No part of any appropriation contained in this act or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States or of the District of Columbia unless such person is a citizen of the United States or a person in the service of the United States or the District of Columbia on the date of the approval of this act who, being eligible for citizenship, had theretofore filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen or who owes allegiance to the United States."

Mr. CALDWELL. If the gentleman will yield to me, I may say that it is my information that there is no one employed by the District or under this appropriation who is not a citizen; but if the gentleman insists, I see no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. RAYBURN] having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 9102, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, 1941, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments with the

recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment; if not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to ascertain what the program will be for next week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Monday is Consent Day. The committee having in charge appropriations for the War Department say that they cannot be ready before Wednesday. It is my intention to ask unanimous consent on Monday that Calendar Wednesday be transferred to Tuesday. Wednesday and Thursday will be taken up by the War Department appropriation bill. If it should be completed by Thursday night, it is expected that the conference report upon the independent offices appropriation bill will come up Friday.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Also, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], I ask unanimous consent that in the extension of his remarks he be permitted to insert a resolution establishing a tax commission, and an excerpt from the Ways and Means hearing about the commission; also an editorial on the subject from the accountants' publication.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from New York [Mr. COLE] be permitted to extend his own remarks and to include therein an address delivered by the Honorable Frank Gannett.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein a very important and convincing letter from the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a table prepared by the Department of Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the disposition of matters on

the Speaker's table, and other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the address by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] today I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include tables showing the deficit from 1933 to 1939.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders on Thursday next, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman will permit a suggestion, the Chair feels certain that Wednesday and Thursday will be taken up entirely by the business of the House, while Monday and Tuesday will not. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

WATERS OF YELLOWSTONE RIVER

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill S. 1759, granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent the Speaker pro tempore appointed the following conferees: Mr. WHITE of Idaho, Mr. HILL, and Mr. HAWKS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

CENSUS QUESTIONS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the public press on March 26 a statement that the Census Bureau would have available a 5-percent sample of its population enumeration, which would be published during the summer and that the total number of the unemployed might be compiled before the election.

That statement challenges my attention. The implication that any reasonable person can possibly draw from such an announcement on the part of the Census Bureau is that it might have a direct relation or a direct bearing on the coming election next November. If such is not the correct conclusion, if that is not a reasonable interpretation of such an announcement, why does the Census Bureau single out the one subject, the unemployed, to be announced before the election?

That announcement standing alone may not be impressive enough to challenge the attention of the people if it were not associated with certain questions to be asked by an army of 130,000 census enumerators who are to begin their work next week.

The census of 1940 has been given wide publicity. The attention of the whole Nation has been drawn to the fact that the people were to be subjected to questioning heretofore unknown to the people of the United States.

A resolution was introduced in the Senate during this session of Congress by a distinguished Senator from the State of New Hampshire, calling upon that historic legislative body to express itself in opposition to questions relating to the

income of the people and to instruct the Bureau of the Census and the Secretary of Commerce, Hon. Harry Hopkins, that it was their judgment that such questions relating to income should be deleted. A hearing on this resolution was held by a subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, and full opportunity given for the proponents and opponents of that resolution to state their views.

After the hearing the committee reported it favorably to the Senate, but no further action has been taken.

I introduced an identical resolution in this House on February 26, being House Resolution 397, and which provides as follows:

Whereas section 4 of the act of June 18, 1929 (providing for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses), provides that "the fifteenth and subsequent censuses shall be restricted to inquiries relating to population, to agriculture, to irrigation, to drainage, to distribution, to unemployment, and to mines," and

Whereas the act of August 11, 1939 (providing for a national census of housing), extends the scope of the population inquiry of the Sixteenth Decennial Census to include the obtaining of information with respect to dwelling structures and dwelling units in the United States; and

Whereas neither of the acts aforementioned nor any other act of Congress authorizes the officers and employees of the United States charged with the duty of taking the Sixteenth Decennial Census to make inquiries with respect to income; and

Whereas, notwithstanding the absence of authority to make inquiries with respect to income, questions numbered 32 and 33 on the forms prepared by the Bureau of the Census to be used by the enumerators in taking the Sixteenth Census are as follows:

"Amount of money, wages, or salary received (including commissions)." (1939.)

"Did this person receive income of \$50 or more from sources other than money, wages, or salary?" (1939); and

Whereas no jurisdiction can exist for officers and employees of the United States to lawfully arrogate to themselves the power to make unauthorized inquiries into the private affairs of citizens; and

Whereas it is particularly dangerous for officers and employees of the United States to abuse their authority in cases where citizens may tolerate such abuse of authority because of their fear of being prosecuted criminally; therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Director of the Census and the Secretary of Commerce should immediately cause to be deleted from the population schedule proposed to be used in taking the sixteenth decennial census inquiries Nos. 32 and 33 now appearing upon such proposed schedule.

Little opportunity has been presented for the Congress to express itself in relation to this new form of inquisition into the private affairs of the people. We all know that at this late date no action will be taken, but the Bureau of the Census, after proceedings were instituted in this Congress and after the resolution had been favorably reported, apparently believing that its position was untenable in insisting that questions 32 and 33 should be asked; and, undoubtedly, believing it had no legal right to ask the questions relating to income, and that it had gone beyond the scope of the law, resorted to the strategy adopted and known to the legal profession as "confession and avoidance." Confessing that the Bureau had no legal right to inquire into the income of the people and avoiding the issue by permitting the people to answer the questions in private without divulging their income to the enumerators but setting forth their income on a private slip of paper and sealing it in an envelope.

If the Bureau of the Census and the Secretary of Commerce had had any legal right whatever to inquire and snoop into the incomes of the people, they would not have retreated nor used this subterfuge to obtain the information.

The statute under which this census is to be taken clearly sets forth seven subjects to which inquiry can be made, namely, population, irrigation, agriculture, drainage, distribution, unemployment, and mines. It is strictly a statute of limitation. It is inclusive in the number of subjects listed and it is exclusive of all other subjects. No one can read into the law what is not there and nowhere in the statute is the subject of income mentioned. If Congress had intended, when it passed the law in 1929, that the income of the people should be a subject of inquiry, it would have said so. But having failed to include that subject no one, not even a bureau or a department of the Government, has any right to assume authority for making inquiry regarding a subject

which concerns the private affairs of the people. Such dictatorial and bureaucratic procedure and assumption of authority is one way to undermine the guaranteed rights of a free people and as Washington once predicted, "It means the eating away of the coast line of our national existence."

Now I desire to return to the subject that the Bureau of the Census deems so important that the information to be obtained should be published before election and that is the subject of the unemployed.

I have in my possession a copy or sample questionnaire issued by the Bureau of the Census relating to the population schedule. I also have in my possession a copy of the instructions delivered to this vast army of 130,000 enumerators.

Question 21 to be asked is as follows:

Was this person at work for pay or profit in private or non-emergency Government work during week of March 24-30? Yes or No.

Questions 22, 23, 24, and 25 are not to be asked if the answer is "Yes" to question 21. Question 21, above quoted, looks innocent enough standing alone, but when it is associated with the instructions sent out by the Bureau of the Census to the enumerators it becomes an inquiry not only to arouse suspicion but one that challenges the good faith and the proper intent of the Bureau of the Census in obtaining the information. What is the meaning of the words "at work" as interpreted by the Bureau of the Census?

If question 21 is answered "Yes or No," in accordance with the instructions placed in the hands of the enumerators, it will result in an inaccurate, unreliable, and untruthful census in regard to the number of unemployed.

I quote the instructions issued in regard to this subject found on pages 50 and 51 of Instructions to Enumerators, section 498 (b) and section 501 (b); and page 52, (d), section 498:

Enter "Yes" also for any person who worked during the week at unpaid family work as defined below.

Enter "Yes" for a person with a business of his own (such as a store owner, a radio-repair man, a contractor, or a peddler) who operated his business, that is, who attempted to sell his wares or to obtain orders, even though he may not have made any sales or performed any services during the week.

Section 501 (d), page 52, Instructions to Enumerators:

Enter "Yes" for each person who worked for pay or profit in his or her own home at any time during the week, as for example, a woman who took in laundry, or who made artificial flowers that she intended to sell, or did sewing at home for a shop or clothing factory.

In answering question 21, which is subtle and deceptive in the information it seeks to elicit when related to the instructions given, it might be well to give in full not only question 21 on the population schedule of the census blank but also to include questions 22, 23, 24, and 25, which are as follows:

Question No. 22:

If not, was he at work on, or assigned to public emergency work (W. P. A., N. Y. A., C. C. C., etc.), during week of March 24-30? Yes or No.

Question No. 23:

Was this person seeking work? Yes or No.

Question No. 24:

If not seeking work, did he have a job, business, etc.? Yes or No.

Question No. 25:

Indicate whether engaged in home housework (H), in school (S), unable to work (U), or other (Ot).

The first consideration in the study of these questions, if the answer to question 21 is "Yes," the other four are not asked. Bearing in mind the instructions given to the enumerators, let us clearly understand what the Census Bureau believes to be a person "at work." Let us make it understandable. If you worked for pay or profit at any private or non-emergency Government work, regardless of the nature of that work or the amount of money you received during the week of March 24 to 30, 1940, you were employed. In other words, if you were out trying to peddle razor blades, shoe-laces, flavoring extracts, although really unemployed, or if

you took out the ashes for a neighbor for pay, shoveled the snow from the sidewalks for pay, washed the windows in a store that week for pay, even though you had never done it before nor be offered the job thereafter, you would be employed. And you would also be employed whether or not you sold any razor blades, flavoring extract, or other articles; and the same is true if your wife made an effort to make a sale—she would be employed. If through sheer necessity she took in the first bundle of laundry or did a little sewing at home for some shop or factory, she would be employed; or if she made a few artificial flowers which she intended to sell, even though she was not successful in selling a single flower, she would be listed as employed, or, in the words of the census, "at work."

The same applies to any person 14 years old or over. If you or any member of your family 14 years old or over worked at anything for pay or profit, including unpaid family work, such as helping out at the little newsstand, and so forth, regardless of whether you received any money or not, and if you did, regardless of the amount received, you or they were employed.

Questions 22, 23, and 24 would give the information necessary: Was this person on emergency work? Was this person seeking work? or Did this person have a job?

Let us look at it from another angle. How many people who are, in truth, unemployed will be required to answer "yes" to question No. 21? Who of us, if unemployed, would not try to peddle something or get an odd job here or there in order to get the barest of necessities? Who of us would not cut cordwood for a wealthy neighbor in the North country so that the money would not be called charity, or who of us would not wash the windows of the rich man's home in the Southland for the same reason? Yet all this time we are really unemployed.

Remember that the enumerator is the sole judge of what he will enter upon the schedule; second, that the person furnishing the information is not permitted to see the entries made; third, that this unpropitious question, No. 21, will require an answer of "yes" from untold numbers of persons who are in fact unemployed; fourth, that a "Yes" in answer to this question causes the other employment questions to go unasked; and, last but by no means least, the natural temptation of the enumerator to have done with it. Question No. 21 looms large and foreboding.

Question No. 21 is dangerous. If it is not removed from the census schedules, there may be 1,000,000, 2,000,000, or even 3,000,000 less unemployed people to talk about in the coming Presidential campaign.

Referring to "Instructions to Enumerators—Population and Agriculture—1940," known as form No. PA-1, page 4, paragraph 20:

Untruthful replies: You have a right not only to an answer, but to a truthful answer. Do not accept any statement that you believe to be false. Where you know that the answer is incorrect, enter upon the schedule the correct answer as nearly as you can ascertain it.

This instruction, above quoted, gives the enumerator a free hand to enter upon the schedule any answer which he, the enumerator, thinks is right. The supposition or assumption that the enumerator can answer the question better than the citizen questioned is preposterous and should not be permitted. Let me quote further from form PA-1, a sentence contained in paragraph 21:

Be particularly careful that no person is reading the entries you are making or the entries you have made for other households.

In other words, the person being questioned has no guarantee, even though he is truthful in every detail, that the enumerator is putting it down in the book right, because he is not permitted to see that it is done right. Remember this instruction because it is exceedingly important.

Questions 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 covering the employment situation are cunningly and ingeniously framed and when asked in their chronological order as per strict instructions set forth in PA-1, page 50, paragraph 496—

Do not ask them in any other order.

present a unique picture of an attempt to show that there are a great many less unemployed people in the country than is actually the case.

It must be obvious to every thinking citizen that the enumerator is not himself entitled to anything, as his right, except to ask the questions contained in the questionnaire and to receive and record the citizen's answers thereto. If the enumerators followed this instruction they will have been authorized to set themselves as the judges of the integrity of the citizens, as the judges of the truthfulness of the citizens' answers, and the result of the census will be an inaccurate and unreliable mixture of what the citizens say is true and what the census enumerators decided to put in because they thought it was true. Any enumerator who might not choose to believe some citizen would, under his instruction, be authorized to disregard the citizen's answers and to put in such answers as the enumerator might believe to fit the particular case.

A very grave danger lies here. When the questionnaire reaches Washington, if some official should investigate and should determine that some answer was incorrect, and should undertake to invoke the penalty of fine or imprisonment against the citizen, how would any man or woman be able to prove that the enumerator had answered the question according to his belief, instead of according to the facts as represented by the citizen?

There is not time enough to touch on all the dangers involved in the way the 1940 decennial census is to be conducted. Suffice it to say, however, that attempts never heretofore dreamed of are being made to ignore the Bill of Rights, to defy the Constitution, to override the liberties of the citizens, and to set up a precedent of arbitrary regulation, and then to endeavor to invoke the penalties prescribed by the Congress for failure to answer proper questions in order that the bureaucrats may compel the answering of questions not contemplated by the Congress when it passed the law. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. KELLER. Is it not true that at every 10-year period, when the census is taken, new questions have always been used to cover the new conditions that have arisen in the meantime?

Mr. DONDERO. I have no information on the subject that new questions have been asked, but this census is to be taken under the 1929 law, and the questions that I complain about were not included in the census of 1930.

Mr. KELLER. But, as a matter of fact, I think the gentleman knows, because I have a very high regard for his intelligence, and ordinarily for his judgment, that what I have suggested is true—that every time we have included new questions from the very First Census until the last one.

Mr. DONDERO. When they are authorized by law, yes; but the 1929 act only includes seven subjects, and "income" is not one of them. It is a statute of limitation.

Mr. KELLER. One of the most important things we have to consider at this time is the matter of national income.

Mr. DONDERO. Let me say to my able friend from Illinois that if the income of the people is an important question, why does not the Government of the United States now divulge the information it has concerning every person in this Nation with an income of \$1,000 or more?

Mr. KELLER. Unfortunately, it has not that information to the extent that we must have it, and this information which we are asking for will go much more fully into it than has been done before. It does seem to me that we ought to dig in and find out what the national income is to be in this Nation, because without it we cannot intelligently discuss the questions that are facing us at the present time, in my judgment. Why not have it done? The gentleman does not object to answering that, does he?

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman mean the question of income?

Mr. KELLER. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. I do not, for the reason that the Government already has the information in regard to my income.

Mr. KELLER. If it did not have it, you would not object to it?

Mr. DONDERO. I would object to it unless the Congress authorizes it. It is an unauthorized question as it stands under the present law.

Mr. KELLER. As a matter of fact, have not the officials of the Census Bureau always had authority to make whatever questions they really found necessary to bring out the facts in the case?

Mr. DONDERO. Oh, I think not. I do not think my able friend from Illinois believes that, unless the Census Bureau is authorized by Congress to do so.

Mr. KELLER. From the very first time to this last census it has been within the discretion of the officials to ask whatever questions they saw fit.

Mr. DONDERO. I must disagree with any such conclusion as that. They do not have the right to ask a single question not authorized by Congress.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks there is any reason why a snooping enumerator could not obtain the information contained in the answers made in confidence and put it in an envelope, by just opening that envelope if he wants to, and then if it is of value to him, from a neighborhood gossip standpoint, putting the name of the person who contributed that envelope on the outside of the envelope?

Mr. DONDERO. Well, I think the method now employed to obtain the information regarding income will not suffice, will not be accurate, and will be entirely unreliable, and it is not authorized by law. That is my objection to it.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I do not want to have the gentleman misunderstand me.

Mr. DONDERO. That would be possible, as the gentleman suggests, of course.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Absolutely. My only opposition to this is—and I do not want to be misunderstood—from the standpoint of one who comes from a rural State and who knows how widely disseminated all information is, notwithstanding the law and the prohibitions contained in it, with respect to GEORGE DONDERO's business if he lives in Northfield, Vt. Everybody will know it overnight. I do not think it is anybody's business, and if large incomes are to be advertised and small incomes are to be advertised, I do not take any exception to that, but I am opposed to this great Government of the United States getting down to the basis of a missionary meeting—gossip society.

Mr. DONDERO. Of course, I will say to the gentleman from Vermont that if they did know my business they would be surprised how little it is.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Does the gentleman know that the National Association of Merchants has made a special request that the Census Bureau compile the very information he criticizes?

Mr. DONDERO. I have heard that discussed before the Senate committee, and I wonder why they want to know how much a man's salary might be below \$1,000 when the Internal Revenue Department already has it for every person in the Nation above \$1,000.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Does not the gentleman think that if we now had the information we are seeking to obtain in the coming census whereby we could make comparisons down throughout the length of time this Government has been in operation that it would be invaluable in the consideration of the development of the country, legislative trends, and trends of business development?

Mr. DONDERO. That is a matter open to argument and long discussion. There is no authority for asking or making inquiry for such information at the present time.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. Certainly.

Mr. HEALEY. If I understand the gentleman correctly in his reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER], he said Congress has directly and inflexibly stated the questions that may be asked by an enumerator of the census.

Mr. DONDERO. No. I answered the gentleman's question in this way: Congress has passed a law on the subjects about which inquiry can be made, and that income is not one of them.

Mr. HEALEY. There is, of course, much room for discussion on the part of the authorities charged with taking the census as to the type of question that will conform with the subject matter.

Mr. DONDERO. To answer the gentleman, the only reason the Census Bureau thinks it has a right to ask the questions on income is because it claims that income is akin to population. There is not a Member in this House but can think of more intimate and delicate questions more closely related to the subject of population than income.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized for 10 minutes.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and myself, members of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Labor Relations Board may have 10 days in which to file minority views in connection with the majority report which is to be submitted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of flood control and navigation in the Red River Valley, a speech I made recently over the radio.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COAST DEFENSES

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I do not expect to use all the time allotted to me, but I want to direct the attention of the House to the thought that there are certain aspects of national defense to which we have not, perhaps, given close enough attention. One of these is coast defense. Today I introduced a resolution, which is entirely local in character, calling upon the Secretary of War to report to the House of Representatives concerning, first, the nature and adequacy of existing measures of defense on the coast of southern California against hostile attack; second, what, if any, critical shortages in personnel or equipment for the United States Army exists which might jeopardize a successful defense of the coast of southern California; third, the scope of existing harbor-defense projects and the adequacy of such projects when completed to provide a reasonable defense of the harbors of such coast; and, fourth, the present stage of completion of existing harbor-defense projects in southern California and the policy of the War Department as to their completion. This is entirely local in character, but it is my hope that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs may consider this matter of sufficient importance to broaden the resolution to include the entire coast of the United States.

When the War Department officials or any other department officials come before the Appropriations Committee they may testify voluntarily only within the limits of the budget which is under consideration. Consequently the information

of record in the committee hearings is likely to be incomplete. It is incomplete unless some member of the committee takes it upon himself to make a deeper inquiry by questioning the departmental witness beyond the scope of the budget.

I have introduced this resolution not in any sense of alarm, but because I am sure that we do not have full and complete information on our coast defenses, and certainly our coast defenses are our second line of defense. I am particularly interested in adequate defense for the coast of southern California because I live there and I am certain that the present defenses are inadequate to prevent even a raid, let alone a vigorous attack. I do not anticipate any raid or attack, but the best insurance is a good defense posture.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Has the gentleman made a similar request of the Navy Department?

Mr. HINSHAW. No; I have not. I am thinking particularly of the military aspect of the coast defenses. The Hepburn committee made a complete report concerning the naval aspect of defenses all over the United States and its Territories and island possessions.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Does the gentleman think you can get the Army and the Navy to agree on what is adequate defense for southern California?

Mr. HINSHAW. Of course, I do not know. However, there is between the Navy and Army what is called the joint board. The General Staff of the Army and the high command of the Navy are both represented on this board, and it is assumed they cooperate in such matters.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. Is it not the proper procedure for that board to present evidence before the Naval Affairs Committee and the Military Affairs Committee and ask for these additional defenses?

Mr. HINSHAW. Not unless they are called upon or directed to do so, as I understand it.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not use any more of my time except to say again that I hope the Committee on Military Affairs will consider this matter favorably and perhaps enlarge the scope of this inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an opinion of the Supreme Court rendered March 25, 1940, on the Puerto Rican land situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 1, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on the following dates on the matters named:

Tuesday, April 2, 1940:

H. R. 7169, authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to establish additional boards of local inspectors in the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation.

Tuesday, April 9, 1940:

H. R. 7637, relative to liability of vessels in collision.

Tuesday, April 16, 1940:

H. R. 8475, to define "American fishery."

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Insular Affairs on Monday, April 15, 1940, at 10 a. m., for the continued consideration of H. R. 8239, creating the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization Wednesday, April 3, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of private bills and unfinished business.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

Tuesday, April 2, 1940:

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Tuesday, April 2, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 3648.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On April 2, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., there will be continued before Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary, a hearing on the bill (H. R. 7534) to amend an act to prevent pernicious political activity (to forbid the requirement that poll taxes be paid as a prerequisite for voting at certain elections). The hearings will be held in room 346, House Office Building, and will be continued on the following dates: April 3, April 9, and April 10, at 10:30 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS ON FLOOD-CONTROL BILL OF 1940 BEGINNING APRIL 1, 1940, AT 10 A. M. DAILY

The hearings will be on reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, and on amendments to existing law. The committee plans to report an omnibus bill with authorizations of approximately one hundred and fifty to one hundred and seventy-five million dollars, covering the principal regions of the country.

Maj. Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, the president of the Mississippi River Commission, the assistants to the Chief of Engineers, the division engineers, and the district engineers will be requested to submit additional statements as individual projects are considered and as desired by the committee.

1. Monday, April 1: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects on the White River and tributaries.

2. Tuesday, April 2: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects in report on rivers in Texas and the Southwest.

3. Wednesday, April 3: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects in the Los Angeles area and in the Pacific Northwest.

4. Thursday, April 4: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects in Colorado and other western areas.

5. Friday, April 5: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Mississippi River and other tributaries.

6. Saturday, April 6: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for other drainage-basin areas for other projects in other parts of the country.

7. Monday, April 8: Representatives from the Department of Agriculture and other governmental agencies.

8. Tuesday, April 9: Senators and Members of Congress.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1494. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 19, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of, and reexamination of reports on Wilson Harbor, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937, and requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted May 12, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 679); to the Committee on

Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1495. A letter from the chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1939, together with supplementary information covering the period July 1 to September 30, 1939; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. DIES: Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities. House Resolution 446. Resolution to certify report of the House of Representatives' Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia to proceed against James H. Dolsen for contempt, (Rept. No. 1900). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9139. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1901). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Intermediate report of the Special Committee of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, appointed pursuant to House Resolution 258, to investigate the National Labor Relations Board; without amendment (Rept. No. 1902). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 9153. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Big Sur River, also the Carmel River, and their tributaries in the county of Monterey and State of California, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 9154. A bill to promote the national health and welfare through appropriation of funds for the construction of hospitals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 9155. A bill to provide for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the Tennessee National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 9156. A bill for the creation of the United States De Soto Exposition Commission to provide for the commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the first crossing of the Mississippi River, by Hernando De Soto, the commemoration of De Soto's visit to the Chickasaw Territory in Northern Mississippi, and the two hundred and fifth anniversary of the Battle of Ackia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 9157. A bill to authorize the establishment of a fish-cultural station in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 9158. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the protection of certain enlisted men of the Army," approved August 19, 1937, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 9159. A bill providing for a preliminary examination and survey of St. Petersburg Harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 9160. A bill to provide for trials of and judgments upon the issue of good behavior in the case of certain Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 9161. A bill to amend the Panama Canal Act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey:

H. R. 9162. A bill to provide for the construction of five vessels for the Coast Guard designed for ice-breaking and assistance work; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 9163. A bill to amend chapter 21 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the processing tax on certain oils imported from the Philippine Islands or other possessions of the United States, so as to provide uniform treatment for Guam, American Samoa, and the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 9164. A bill relating to the acquisition of foreign silver by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 502. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for work relief and relief in certain drought-stricken areas of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. Res. 447. Resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to transmit to the House of Representatives a report relative to a survey of the possibilities and prerequisites of the development of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MOSER:

H. Res. 448. Resolution to provide for an investigation of the Civil Service Commission and its activities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. Res. 449. Resolution directing the Secretary of War to provide certain information concerning the coast defenses of southern California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MACIEJEWSKI:

H. R. 9165. A bill for the relief of John Carroll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 9166. A bill granting a pension to Sarah C. Freeland; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KITCHENS:

H. R. 9167. A bill for the relief of Ben H. Thomason; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CROWE:

H. R. 9168. A bill for the relief of Ellison McCurry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H. R. 9169. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jane Vanskiver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 9170. A bill for the relief of Robert P. Sick; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7250. By Mr. McANDREWS: Petition of the racing homing-pigeon fanciers and friends of Chicago, Ill., supporting House bill 7813; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7251. By Mr. HART: Petition of the New Jersey Press Association, opposing the Patman chain-store bill as menacing to free business enterprise and destructive of chain stores whose natural development has been to the benefit of consumers and producers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7252. Also, petition of the New Jersey Audubon Society, Newark, N. J., favoring the adoption of the plan of flood control for the Passaic River Valley which contemplates a dry detention dam being constructed at Two Bridges and which would not result in permanently flooding any of the Passaic River bottom lands above Two Bridges; to the Committee on Flood Control.

7253. Also, petition of the Associated General Contractors of New Jersey, Trenton, N. J., opposing the use of Work Projects Administration funds and Work Projects Administration labor on Federal-aid highway projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7254. Also, petition of the New Jersey State Federation of Labor, Newark, N. J., favoring the passage of the amendments to the National Labor Relations Act sponsored by the American Federation of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

7255. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petition of Harrison White, of Indianapolis, Ind., relating to the fiscal policy of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7256. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of residents of El Paso, Tex., urging passage of the Neely block-booking bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7257. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of L. Litman, president, and Sara Durham, secretary, Townsend Club, No. 1, Moundville, W. Va., lamenting the passing of the late Senator William Edgar Borah, of Idaho; to the Committee on Memorials.

7258. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the General Welfare Federation of America, Inc., State of Florida, Congressional District No. 1, asking that the Seventy-sixth Congress enact the improved General Welfare Act (H. R. 5620); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7259. Also, petition of the American Student Union, University of California Chapter, making certain demands regarding the National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7260. Also, petition of the American Communications Association, Local 31, supporting Senate bill 591; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7261. Also, petition of the Polish Community Home, Binghamton, N. Y., with respect to aid and relief from America for the suffering, needy, and starving people of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7262. Also, petition of the International Workers Order, Branch 939, asking for the discontinuance of the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

7263. Also, petition of Thelma R. Grimm and sundry citizens of Columbus, Ohio, requesting the passage of the Neely bill (S. 280); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 1, 1940

(Legislative day of Monday, March 4, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Duncan Fraser, assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art the Father of all men upon the earth, most heartily we pray that Thou wilt deliver Thy children from the cruelties of war and lead the nations into the way of peace. Teach us to put away all bitterness and misunderstanding, that we, with all the brethren of the Son of Man, may draw together as one comity of peoples and dwell evermore in the fellowship of that Prince of Peace who liveth and reigneth with Thee in the unity of the Holy Spirit both now and for evermore. Amen.